ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

270 B88c
Bunsen v.2
1871489
Christianity and mankind
STORAGE

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

STO
ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EMD-174

8884

CHRISTIANITY

AND

MANKIND,

THEIR BEGINNINGS AND PROSPECTS.

BY

CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN,
D.D., D.C.L., D.PH.

V 2

IN SEVEN VOLUMES.

SECOND VOLUME.

THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY CHICAGO

HISTORICAL SECTION.

HIPPOLYTUS AND HIS AGE; OR, THE BEGINNINGS AND PROSPECTS OF CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. II.

THE LIFE OF THE CHRISTIANS OF THE APOSTOLICAL AGE.

LONDON:
LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS.
1854.

1871489

13489
Z

LONDON:
A. and G. A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-street-Square.

HIPPOLYTUS AND HIS AGE;

OR,

THE BEGINNINGS AND PROSPECTS

OF

CHRISTIANITY.

BY

CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN,

D.D., D.C.L., D.PH.

SECOND EDITION.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

THE LIFE OF THE CHRISTIANS OF THE APOSTOLICAL AGE.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS.

1854.

TO

The Memory

OF

THOMAS ARNOLD.

DU HAST MIT UNS GEKÄMPFET DES GLAUBENS HEILGEN KAMPF,
FÜR ALLE TIEF EMPFUNDEN DER BITTREN LEIDEN KRAMPF:
DU SAHST DER MENSCHHEIT NAHEN GERICHT UND BLUTGEN STREIT,
KLAR STAND VOR DEINEM AUGE DER JAMMER DIESER ZEIT.

DA TRAF DICH JENES SEHNEN DAS STILLT DER ERDE SCHMERZ,
ES LÖSTE SICH IN LIEBE DAS MILDE STREITERHERZ,
BEGRÜSSTEST HELD ALS BOTEN GESANDT VON VATERHAND,
DEN ENGEL DER DICH FÜHRTE INS EWGE HEIMATHLAND.

VERSTUMMT IST NUN AM GRABE DES ZORNS UND HASSES WUTH,
EIN LEUCHTTHURM RAGST DU STRAHLEND AUS NÄCHTGER STURMES FLUTH,
ES SPROSSET HEILGER SAMEN IN MANCHER JUNGEN BRUST,
EIN VOLK VOLL EDLEN STOLZES BLICKT AUF ZU DIR MIT LUST.

DU SELBST BIST WEGGERÜCKET AUS DER VERWIRRUNG NOTH,
DAS SCHWERSTE SEELENLEIDEN HAT DIR ERSPART DER TOD:
ES LIEGT VOR DIR ENTHÜLLET DAS RÄTHSEL DIESER WELT,
SCHAUST NUN WAS DU GEGLAUBET VON GOTTES LICHT ERHELLT.

WIR ABER WOLLEN KÄMPFEN WIE DU ES VORGETHAN,
IN HOFFNUNG UND IN LIEBE MIT GLAUBEN ANGETHAN,
DIE EWIGKEIT VOR AUGEN, WAHRHAFTIGKEIT IM SINN,
UND GEBEN FÜR DIE WAHRHEIT DAS LEBEN WILLIG HIN.

INTRODUCTION.

THE First Volume gives the confession of Hippolytus, and his portrait as one of the leading men of the first seven Christian generations: the Second presents the picture of his Age, by exhibiting the Book of the ancient Church and giving its interpretation. The First Part presents the documents of early Christianity, in which the common consciousness and the Christian life of that age are authentically recorded. They are the picture: their interpretation and application are attempted in the Second Part. Such being its object, it, first of all, lays before us the picture itself, in an explanatory form. It, secondly, reflects in that picture the present time, connected with it through the history of fifteen centuries. Lastly, it endeavours to deduce from it a practical application for the reform of our present state. Of the subjects which come thus under our consideration, there is one which unites the two elements, the community-life and theology—namely, the Liturgies of the ancient Church. I have excluded from the general Text-Books of ancient Christianity all liturgical formularies which contain extraneous matter not common to all ancient Churches and consequently to all the Liturgies transmitted to us.

The object of the First Part of the Picture is to restore the authentic texts of the "Church- and House-Book of the early Christians," and of the "Law-Book of the Ante-Nicene Church." The first we exhibit rescued by our researches from the rubbish in which it was enveloped for centuries, and disencumbered of the fraud and misunderstanding by which it was defaced. The second, the Law-Book, we have been enabled to present in its more original text, under the guidance of the Coptic Collection. They are both mere single leaves rescued from the flood of time, the legacies of seven generations, who wrote, with their

own blood, the annals of the life of their hidden community, so important to universal history. In spite of the fictitious form which disguises their real contents, they exhibit the venerable picture of that primitive age in a recognisable and intelligible shape. They are essentially a childlike appendix to the New Testament, and at the same time an independent test of its truth, as being the fulfilment of what the Gospel promises. For here we find, on the one hand, a continuation of the Ordinances of the Apostles, as given in their canonical Epistles; on the other, the advice which the three great Apostles and the brother of our Lord had communicated in their canonical writings, applied, in the Apostolic spirit, to the wants of the Church, and of the human race renovated in that Church. These little insignificant books, then, as a whole, represent nothing less than the framework of the new world, which was to arise out of the spirit, life, and death of Christ, and out of the exhortations of his Apostles, that is to say, the world-renewing Christian Society, or the Universal Church. The revelation given to us by Christ has no other historical basis than in what the Bible records. The actual historical proof, however, of the truth of the Biblical revelation, lies only in the Church. The Church, again, is in an eminent sense that primitive congregation, whose quiet and exalted working in the first seven generations these leaves authenticate.

The Church- and House-Book of the ancient Church, more especially, is a book recording that Christian wisdom and piety inspired by the Holy Ghost. It is a book composed by believing souls whose names are only known to God, and sealed with the blood of the confessors of the faith. It exhibits a testimony of faith in the moral government of the world, practically tried; a testimony to the freedom of mind and to the indestructibility of the dignity of man, against the tyranny of a Nero and the administration of justice of a Trajan; a light in the midst of the darkness of despairing infidelity, and of a comfortless philosophy among the educated classes. There is nothing which makes this document more venerable than its divine simplicity and childlikeness. Let no one open its leaves who does not know how to value this simplicity. To him who will not read

them, as the Bible must be read, with pure and respectful feelings, they will only give offence and be injurious; he will only wrong, without in the least understanding them.

It is difficult to say whether the ordinances of the early Christian age, which were attributed to the Apostles, are more important from what they establish, or from their abstaining from laying down rules and formularies upon other points. The ordinances themselves are of great consequence, not merely to those Churches which derive their doctrine and constitution from the Apostolic Church, but likewise to those which feel a vocation to frame, with Christian freedom, their own institutions directly from the Sacred Records. Those ordinances show to the old Churches, that their forms do not (as they assume) harmonize with the spirit and letter of that age; to the Reformed Churches, that their articles and practices cannot be established on the letter of the Bible alone, but that, if these practices are based upon any truly ancient authority, they rest upon traditional primitive customs. For much which they have defended for three centuries, as Biblical, is neither Biblical nor Apostolical, except so far as the Christian freedom which they have exercised is truly evangelical. To Romanists, therefore, and Protestants, these records preach temper and moderation; and to those among them who are willing to listen to their voice, they proclaim reason and freedom.

They are, however, not less important for what, out of faith in the operation of the Spirit in the Church, they leave to the evangelical liberty, either of the special congregation or of the individual. They prove, therefore, directly and indirectly, that, without this emancipation from the letter, the restored Church, which is that of the Future, can no more exist, than it can without the spirit of that grand Christian view which is reflected in these ordinances.

That no Church, no Christian society, corresponds exactly with this picture of Apostolic reality, would, as a general remark, prove nothing. For no age, however primitive, not even that of the Apostles themselves (the first century, or the first two generations), is in its phenomena, its institutions, and its forms, perfect, or suitable for all times. That a form should

express the wants and suit the condition of its times is essential to its perfection; but this condition changes, and no age is without its faults. What I mean here to say is this: that no historical Church of the present day can be compared with that Apostolic age, without manifold misconceptions of later times becoming lamentably apparent in that light of truth and of substantial reality. Between us and those Fathers, empty phantoms have started up, darkening that primitive age: and, wherever these dark phantoms are received as lights, they will obscure the light of primitive antiquity, and falsify the life of our own time. A severe trial, therefore, awaits any one who looks primitive Christianity in the face.

The first effect is to engender perplexity, wavering, and doubt. Men of less serious minds, or persons brought up in slavery, and not feeling the need of freedom, may be led by it to unbelief, whether in the form of a total abandonment of Christianity as the religion of the future, or in the form of a refuge in an external infallibility which puts an end not only to all thought, but also to all real belief. This is the state of men's minds in the higher classes of society in Romanic countries; and threatens to become their state in the Established Church of half Germanic, half Celto-Romanic England.

And yet, what clear-headed and honest inquirer, to whom Christianity is a life, and its renovation the condition on which all the hopes for the future of the European world are based, has not felt, in our trying and almost Apocalyptic times, the want of entering into communion of life with the spirit of primitive Christianity? Who is there so infatuated by the canonized forms of his own Church, as not to wish to behold, in all its reality, her supposed model? Or what reflecting Bible Christian is there, whose belief in the letter is so firm, that he can venture to remain indifferent to hearing how those Apostolical men understood that letter, and how they endeavoured to realize that message of salvation in doctrine and in worship, in faith and in life? You take your stand upon the Church; here is its commencement. You take your stand upon the Bible; here is its first Apostolical realization. What is required of you is, not to substitute scholarship and research for simple

Christian faith, much less to set up the idol of philosophy in the shrine of religion. You have no longer to deal with the abstract philosophy and barren research of the eighteenth century; you live in the nineteenth, one of historical philosophy and of reconstruction. The work to which we are called is, unwearicdly and humbly to sweep the porch of the Temple; to clear the floor; not to riot as destructives in the darkened chambers, but to bestir ourselves to restore and to allow the light of Heaven to penetrate within them. It is the rubbish of false learning and conventional scholasticism which separates us from the Sanctuary, and it is high time to sweep it away, as the signs of the latter days have appeared, in which infidel superstition intends to usurp the altar, and wilful falsehood the throne of truth.

Assuming, now, the result of such a conscientious examination of facts and documents to be what I have arrived at in this and in the preceding Volume (and I am firmly convinced, no thinker and investigator can arrive, upon the whole, at a very different conclusion), the question arises: What is to be done? Shall we build ourselves a new house out of some blocks of the Apostolic age, upon the ruins of the one in which we were born and live? Or shall we, in the despair of unbelief, and in the weakness of materialism (which is real ungodliness), refuse all research and all investigation into our Church life and common constitution, in whatsoever shape; and above all, shall we refuse to lay a finger on the plague-spots, because we might make the evil worse? Is this not saying, in other words, that Christianity is not true? Or, since the ecclesiastical foundations are everywhere gone or giving way, shall we try to strengthen them by outward forms, or, if need be, support them by force, because the forms of religion are so closely connected with state arrangements and outward customs, and even, perhaps, with influence and power, wealth and interest? Or shall we rake up all the arts of sophistry and false learning, straining at gnats and swallowing camels, in order to persuade people that all is right, although the form satisfies the conscience no longer, and leaves the mind empty?

Humanly speaking, the possibility of a peaceable and really

reconstructive European solution of this question, at the present moment, depends on Germany and England, and, beyond the Atlantic, on the giant scion of England, which practically developes, more and more, in an original manner peculiar to itself, the germs of the Protestant life received from the mother country, and attaches itself intellectually more strongly and inwardly to Germany. And here we must not conceal from ourselves a circumstance deserving of great consideration in reference to England and Germany. As the German of the last hundred years has far too little inclination for reality and life, so the Englishman of the same period has too little propensity towards research and knowledge. In the one case, the idea has great difficulty in becoming reality; in the other, the form is slow to become a conscious idea. This is a sad, but incontrovertible fact, which I feel myself compelled by internal conviction to state. It is a matter important for the history of the world, and threatens to become fatal; for no real restoration can take place without the union of those two elements. But there is still time to do this. All, indeed, that is required at this instant, in order to avert destruction, is merely to open the way to a union of the leading minds in the two equally noble branches of the Teutonic race, so that each may furnish the other, in harmony with the feelings of the people and the times, with the element in which it is deficient; and, by combining Idea with Reality, and Reality with Idea, may rescue and invigorate the whole. In Germany, the tendency towards the Real is, indeed, increasing, inasmuch as excessive indulgence in the Ideal has produced only fancifulness and debility, and has resulted in tearing the nation to pieces. In England, on the other hand, the want of research and thought, and the desire for intellectual freedom, make themselves felt more and more, and not the least so, indeed, in those who have passed through the school of medieval forms and the enchanted garden of Romanism. The Germans feel that infidelity and slavery follow in the wake of the idolization of science; the English, that the Christian life is not assured without knowledge and inward conviction, and that the Jesuits lurk behind the superstitious attachment to the middle ages. Generally, however, a vast move-

ment, both spiritual and political, even social, indeed, is agitating men's minds, and the nations are convinced that they cannot be free without the Gospel, and that they will neither be able to obtain or retain the Gospel without political liberty.

While, then, we exclude from our counsels all such suggestions of despair, as being equally unworthy of a man and of a Christian, we establish two safe principles. The first is, that, in all congregational and ecclesiastical institutions, Christian freedom, within limits conformable to Scripture, constitutes the first requisite for a vital restoration. The second fundamental principle is, that every Church must hold fast what she already possesses, in so far as it presents itself to her consciousness as true and efficacious. In virtue of the first condition, she will combine Reason and Scripture in due proportions: by virtue of the second, she will distinguish between Spirit and Letter, between Idea and Form. No external clerical forms and mediæval reflexes of bygone social and intellectual conditions can save us, nor can sectarian schisms and isolation from national life. Neither can learned speculations, and still less the incomparably more arrogant dreams of the unlearned. Scientific consciousness must dive into real life, and refresh itself in the feelings of the people, and that no one will be able to do without having made himself thoroughly conversant with the sufferings and the sorrows of the lowest classes of society. For out of the feeling of these sufferings and sorrows, as being to a great degree the most extensive and most deep-seated product of evil, that is, of selfishness, arose, eighteen hundred years ago, the divine birth of Christianity. The new birth, however, requires new pangs of labour, and not only on the part of individuals, but of the whole nation, in so far as she bears within her the germs of future life, and possesses the strength to bring forth. Every nation must set about the work herself, not indeed as her own especial exclusive concern, but as the interest of all mankind. Every people has the vocation to coin for itself the divine form of Humanity, in the Church as well as in the State; its life depends upon this being done, not its reputation merely; it is the condition of existence, not merely of prosperity.

Is it not time, in truth, to withdraw the veil from our misery?

to point to the clouds which rise from all quarters, to the noxious vapours which have already well nigh suffocated us? to tear off the mask from hypocrisy, and destroy that sham which is undermining all real ground beneath our feet? to point out the dangers which surround, nay, threaten already to engulf us? Is the state of things satisfactory in a Christian sense, where so much that is unchristian predominates, and where Christianity has scarcely begun here and there to penetrate the surface of the common life? Shall we be satisfied with the increased outward respect paid to Christianity and the Church? Shall we take it as a sign of renewed life, that the names of God and Christ have become the fashion, and are used as a party badge? Can a society be said to be in a healthy condition, in which material and selfish interests in individuals, as well as in the masses, gain every day more and more the upper-hand? in which so many thinking and educated men are attached to Christianity only by outward forms, maintained either by despotic power, or by a not less despotic, half-superstitious, half-hypocritical custom? When so many churches are empty and satisfy but few, or display more and more outward ceremonials and vicarious rites? When a godless schism has sprung up between spirit and form, or has even been preached up as a means of rescue? When gross ignorance or confused knowledge, cold indifference or the fanaticism of superstition, prevail as to the understanding of Holy Scripture, as to the history, nay, the fundamental ideas of Christianity? When force invokes religion in order to command, and demagogues appeal to the religious element in order to destroy? When, after all their severe chastisements and bloody lessons, most statesmen base their wisdom only on the contempt of mankind; and when the prophets of the people preach a liberty, the basis of which is selfishness, the object libertinism, and the wages are vice? And this in an age the events of which show more and more fatal symptoms, and in which a cry of ardent longing pervades the people, reechoed by a thousand voices!

Let us gaze, then, with the earnestness which this view of the state of the world demands, on the mirror which the Church- and House-Book of the Apostolic age holds up to us.

This mirror shows us, in the Second Part of the present Volume, four pictures. We see in it the Christian school and the Christian congregation, Christian worship and Christian life; four simple childlike pictures, which nevertheless represent the foreshadowing and model of almost everything great, noble, and hallowing, which has sprung up, in renewed youth and beauty, out of the tomb of the old world and renovated the face of the earth.

There is but one element wanting to make this picture complete; the Christian knowledge and philosophy possessed by the ancient Church. The Apology of Hippolytus is principally designed to fill up this gap: it has been clothed in the garb of fiction, as being the most suitable, for reasons already given in the Preface to the First Volume.

By the side of that domestic and congregational life of the ancient Christians, which from the very foundation of social life prepares the new world, a deep mental development, the prefiguration of a new philosophy, pervades the primitive Church, without a representation of which the picture of that age not only would remain incomplete, but in its most essential portions unintelligible.

The original impulse of this mental development lies in the life and declarations of Christ in regard to Himself and His relation with the Father and the Brethren, and in the doctrine of such a communion of the children of God as must convert the dominion of selfishness, of self-will, and of tyranny, into a kingdom of God, into a kingdom of love and truth, of inward law and intellectual freedom. Father, Son, Spirit, and God, Man, Mankind, these are the centres of a system of speculation intimately connected with a deep ethic earnestness, and with a world-renewing instinct of association. The germ of the historical development of this Divine doctrine and this Divine life bursts forth with vital power in the Apostolic writings and histories, and unfolds itself in forms aspiring to universality in the Greek and Roman world; inasmuch as it endeavours to combine the wisdom and learning of that world with the sacred records and the life of the Christians.

Such was the commencement of that great spiritual drama,

the elements, complications, and solutions of which I have attempted to exhibit, partly philosophically, partly historically, in the philosophical key to this work. By the side of a depth of speculative thought striving after truth and knowledge stood a moral power of mind which was maintained through life and in death; a seriousness of character which was rooted in the feeling of the horror of sin on the one hand, and in the belief in salvation and the Divine providential order of an eternal fatherly Love on the other. This combination forms the main strength of ancient Christianity, and constitutes the highest historical significance of its philosophic development of Thought. Its weak side is the unsuccessful attempt to unite the philosophical and historical elements, the Idea and the Fact. But in the midst of the tragic complication which necessarily ensues from this antagonism, two saving elements manifest themselves: the Christian Truth which forms the basis of the system, and the Truthfulness which is reflected in the life of the Church, as it appears in the Church- and House-Book. Scripture and practical Church life regulate and support the scientific consciousness of Apostolic Christianity; and, by both, what is obscure in speculation is cleared up, and what is imperfect in knowledge supplied. Even the unhistorical, half-rabbinical, half-Neo-Platonic system of interpretation (or rather misinterpretation) is so far corrected by these two elements, that, in the main points, the original truth is not lost, but only obscured and distorted.

Shortly after the time of Hippolytus that speculative tone of thought forced itself from the school into the congregation. With the introduction of Christianity into the Roman empire as a State-religion, the metaphysical formulas of the majority of the bishops took the place of the very inmost consciousness and life of Christendom, and claimed submission as the symbols and conditions of union with Christ and his Church. When thus the superior clergy had obtained spiritual supremacy in the world, two fresh races of men appeared on the stage of the Roman world. The Germanic race embraced Christianity under the form of the Roman Church as State-religion: and afterwards, the Slavonic tribes, when they had become impregnated

with Germanic life, adopted Christianity under the Byzantine form of worship. While these are, even at the present moment, still in the background of national development, the Germanic nations, as Romanic and as pure Germanic, for a thousand years have borne the torch of the spirit: the former rather systematizing what had been delivered to them, the latter rather breaking through conventionality in order to penetrate to the free light of the independent spirit. Three centuries before the Romanic nations were driven to shake off by revolution an intolerable yoke of double tyranny, the Germanic strove by ecclesiastical reforms to restore the equilibrium between theology and life, not breaking with the past, but making its idea fructify the present, and thus securing a future truly imbued with Gospel principles. Whatever of real political liberty and of hope exists in the world is the fruit of that reform.

In the meantime, the contrasts which have been exhibited are so vast, that at the first glance Hippolytus and his contemporaries might seem to us unintelligible, and in some points ridiculous; and we certainly, with our state of things, should appear to them incomprehensible, and with our conventionalism very absurd, could they express an opinion upon us.

To bring out the internal connection between the Christian views and theological ideas of the ancient Church, as contrasted with our own times and our state, is the design of that fiction with which the Third Part of this Volume opens—the Apology of Hippolytus. The Appendix with which the Volume closes contains some Essays which refer less to Hippolytus personally than to the general aspirations of the Age, both in Worship and in Constitution.

May the contributions offered in these two Volumes to the better appreciation of a personal character which demands veneration, and of an age sinking indeed, but noble in its aspirations, and of high historical import, not be considered useless, nor at the same time fail in furnishing a mite of consolation and instruction for the sufferings of the present day, and a ray of light for the hopes of the future!

As to the special philosophical and historical results obtained by the researches of these reconstructive Volumes, I shall endeavour to point them out for the general reader in the following concluding words.

I have made, in the Text-Book itself, or in the Book of the Church, for the first time, a complete collection of all that is genuine in the so-called Apostolical Ordinances, as well as of all the creeds, general liturgical forms, psalms, and hymns of the first three centuries (omitting only the canticles which occur in the canonical writings of the New Testament), referring for the Greek texts, Constitutions, &c., to the Liturgical Volumes of the Analecta. In like manner I have, for the first time, elucidated the origin, with some success I trust, and shown the gradual extension and interpolation, of the records of the earliest ecclesiastical law, called the Apostolic Canon. Whatever is excluded from this collection is not genuine. Every Christian reader is now enabled to judge for himself of the value of certain opinions respecting the ancient Church: the critical scholar will find in the Analecta that what is here presented to the public in a popular form is based upon solid critical research.

For the application of the picture of the ancient Church, I have given a documentary view of the history and idea of the Christian sacrifice and Eucharistic service, according to the different epochs of the Liturgy of the Episcopal Churches of England, Scotland, and the United States. The whole interpretation is destined to make that portrait of the ancient Church available to ourselves, and to hold it up as a mirror to our own age. For this purpose I have therefore exposed the contrasts which the Medieval, and in part the Protestant, Churches exhibit to that of the Apostolic age, and I have appealed to the Sacred Records as the Code, and to Christian conscience as the judge. I have also reverently intimated on what basis a national and catholic restoration might be founded, and an organic development be prepared, of those elements of Christian constitution and worship and of the whole Christian life which the primitive Church exhibits to us.

There is no one of the practical questions of the day, either as regards the Church or our social relations, in so far as they are

influenced by Christianity, that I have not taken into consideration, and discussed in a spirit of moderation, but with uncompromising honesty and unreserved frankness.

Two great and stirring (or, as our French neighbours say, burning) questions, which for want of time I had been obliged to pass over at the close of my picture, and reflex of the social relations, the Protestant law of divorce, and the slavery in the United States of America, I have not failed to treat in the same spirit in this new edition.

On all these points I am prepared for misconstructions, contradictions, and attacks, from opposite quarters. Any author who in our times treats theological and ecclesiastical subjects frankly, and therefore with reference to the problems of the age, must expect to be ignored, and, if that cannot be done, abused and reviled. I shall, however, only notice such opponents as will discuss a sacred subject with an impartial love of truth, and who show themselves men of independent thought and of critical research. I shall quietly leave the others to their prejudices, and by silence reply to such as enter into a philosophical discussion with the old cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" It is impossible, in our times, to have an independent opinion on those subjects, without critical study and calm deliberate consideration; and yet everybody thinks himself entitled to pronounce judgment upon them. But the time will come when they will be again made the objects of universal interest and popular research. All tends to that, in Germany from the philosophical, in England from the practical, point of view; and, in both, from a feeling of a great inward and outward necessity. Then it will be seen whether or not the way that I have indicated is the right one. Personally, it is perfectly indifferent to me whether I live to see this or not. I have neither written for my own personal gratification, nor for any party, either here or in Germany, nor for any fashion of the day. I have meditated and inquired from an earnest desire to discover truth, and to meet the wants of a confused and eventful age, which yearns after light and information; and I have said nothing which I have not thoroughly examined and tested for at least twenty-five years. Thus, while I shall not be scared by any dictatorial

assertions, neither will any correction come unwelcome to me. Of the truth of the fundamental views which I have expressed, both here and throughout the work, and of the soundness of their philosophical and historical groundwork, I have as little doubt as I have of my own existence.

This applies, in particular, to my conviction that the question at this moment is not how to carry out, but how to prepare, a second, grand, reconstructive Reformation. The porch of the Temple must first be more thoroughly cleansed than it was in the sixteenth, and, above all, restored more honestly than it was in the seventeenth, century; and, lastly, the work must be handled more practically than has yet been done by the critical German school of this age. In the meantime, let every one cleanse his own heart and house as well as he can. When the feeling of the misery which is coming, and a real faith in the saving truth which is in Christ, shall have thoroughly penetrated the nations, then will the Spirit of God assuredly come upon them with might, either for the reformation or the annihilation of the existing Churches. Whether this crisis will end in the renewal or in the destruction of the present nations and states, will depend upon the position they take in face of the demands of the Gospel, and the wants of the times. For every nation and age has its time and its day of visitation, after which its fate is sealed. This great movement, however, will assuredly not lead to the destruction of Christianity, but to its establishment on a firmer basis; not to the lowering of the person of Jesus of Nazareth, but to his greater glorification: and God's kingdom of Truth and Liberty on earth will advance as triumphantly over the perishing as over the renovated kingdoms and states of the present world.

My belief in this future rests upon the following convictions, which have been considerably strengthened by, and seem to me naturally to flow from, the criticism of the work of Hippolytus and of his age; and which I consider as the final result of the comparison between ancient and modern Christianity and divinity founded upon that criticism.

Christianity is true, because free: and it is free and freeing because true. Christianity is philosophically and historically

true; and it could not be true, except by being so both by its thought and by its history. It is true, by the inexhaustible truth of the eternal thought which it manifests, and by the equally inexhaustible truth of the divine individuality upon which it rests, Jesus of Nazareth. It is true, by the genuineness and historical truth of the apostolical, and evangelical, accounts, which we possess of this exalted individuality, and by the harmony of these records with the living tradition which accompanies it. This tradition is the Church, and the Church is christianized humanity; christianized by the Spirit of Christ, and by the Scripture which that Spirit produced.

The great proof of the divine nature and truth of Christianity is, its power of regenerating the world.

This regenerating power has shown itself twice, in an unparalleled world-renovating change produced by the spirit of Christianity: in the moral and intellectual revival of the ancient world, after the downfal of the universal empire of Rome in the fifth Christian century; and by the moral, intellectual, and political revival of the modern world, after the downfal of the omnipotence of papal Rome in the sixteenth.

Whatever there exists of great, of hopeful, of redeeming, in the present state of the human race, is the effect of Christ and Christianity. This is the true, progressive, and comforting fulfilment of all prophecies of Christ himself, and of His Apostles; and of all those prophetic words and deeds of the ancient world (principally, not exclusively, of the Jewish) which speak of a reign of truth and justice upon this earth.

The nations of Christendom, whether of the Greek and Roman, or of the national, that is to say, Protestant, communions, may live, and ought to live, by the side of each other in charity and peace: but they can only do so by virtue of the great principle of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and of the free political constitutions it has produced and is producing. For that great principle is the moral self-responsibility of each individual, founded upon personal faith in Christ and in His Spirit, reflected as both are by the conscience of the human breast, and by the reason of the human mind. This faith produces necessarily self-responsibility; self-responsibility

produces, and virtually is, self-government: self-government renders possible, and works, political liberty; and this political liberty is the only safeguard, as much as it is itself the fruit, of religious liberty. Both liberties together render material toleration possible without indifference, and prepare the age in which divine charity is to rule paramount over the world. Whoever idolizes the letter of Byzantine Christianity, and the system of medieval Divinity, breaks with the Church of the Apostles; he forfeits the Spirit of Christ, and falls out of that very communion with the ancient believers which he pretends to cherish. Whoever will attempt, whether out of fanaticism, or (which is more likely to be the case, and more condemnable) for political ends, to replace those systems upon the throne of the world, breaks with the present and with the future: and whoever seeks for the conservative element in the restoration of sacerdotal dominion over the conscience, and of priest-rule over national government, prepares not only great political revolutions, but also the entire downfal of the hierarchy itself. Those who have sown superstition have reaped, and are reaping, unbelief; as those who have sown despotism have reaped, and are reaping, anarchy. But those who will do so now, or in any time to come, will bring upon themselves, and, as far as in them lies, upon the world, a much greater convulsion and destruction than ever were witnessed since the downfal of the Roman empire.

To the Picture of the Life of the Ancient Christians and its interpretation, I have added as an Appendix those of the Essays of the Second Volume of my First Edition, which refer less to Hippolytus personally, than to his Age. They treat partly of the Christian sacrifice, partly of the so-called Constitutions and Canons of the Apostles.

I have, in conclusion, to add a word respecting the English style of the Text-Books of the ancient Church. I have adhered throughout to the translations of Whiston and Tattam, except where the text rendered correction indispensable, and

furnished the materials for making it. But, as already remarked, the Coptic text is in many places so unintelligible, that nobody, without fresh critical study, can possibly make a thoroughly satisfactory translation of it. I have accordingly left Tattam's version, on the whole, as it was; although its defects have not escaped my notice. Let any one who is not satisfied with it give us a better text. Some obscure passages I have been enabled to explain in the Appendix to the Text-Book, by means of a Greek text recently discovered.

The interpretation of the Text-Books, with the exception of the Notes, was originally written in German. It has been put into English by my valued friend Mr. Cottrell, the translator of the First Volume of my "Egypt;" but, in finally revising it, I have here and there made such additions and alterations as I thought would render my ideas more intelligible to the English reader.

London, April 22. 1852.

ANALYTICAL TABLE

OF THE

CONTENTS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

Page

INTRODUCTION - - - - - - - - - v

FIRST PART.

THE TEXT-BOOKS OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

THE CHURCH AND HOUSE-BOOK OF THE ANCIENT CHRISTIANS.

First Book: The Reception, the Instruction, the Pledge, and the Admission of the Catechumens: or the Christian Instruction and the Baptism of the early Church - - - - - 5

Appendix:

I. Different Forms of the Creed:

1. According to the Church of Rome - - - - 21

2. According to the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions (doubtful) - - - - - - - 22

II. An Ordinance that the Baptized is to say aloud the Lord's Prayer, as Priest before the People - - - - 23

III. The Order of Baptism in the Church of Jerusalem - - 24

Second Book: The Constitution of the early Church:

A. The First Set of Ordinances of the Church of Alexandria respecting the Clergy - - - - - - - 27

B. The Second Set - - - - - - - - 32

C. The Third Set - - - - - - - - 37

Appendix:

A. The Requisites and Duties of a Bishop, according to the Third Book of the Greek Constitutions - - - - - 42

B. On the Marriage of the Clergy - - - - - 43

Page

Third Book: The Order and Formularies of the Service, or the Christian Sacrifice and Worship of the Ancient Church:

A. The Liturgy, or the General Order of the Service - - 47

B. The recorded early Hymns and Forms of Thanksgiving:

I. The Morning Hymn, or Hymn of Thanksgiving:

1. According to the Codex Alexandrinus - - - 50

2. The same reduced to its primitive Form - - - 50

II. The Morning Verse between Psalm Verses - - - 51

III. The Evening Psalm, composed of Psalm Verses - - 51

IV. The Evening Hymn of the Greek Christians - - 52

V. The Evening Hymn of the Apostolic Constitutions - - 52

Appendix from the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions: Liturgical formularies:

I. A Form of Thanksgiving before the Communion - - 53

II. A Form of Thanksgiving after the Communion - - 53

Fourth Book: Rules of general Conduct for all Members of the Congregation; or the Congregational, Social, and Domestic Life of the early Christians:

First Chapter: Regulations of Christian Life respecting the Worship and Service (from the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions) - - - - - - 57

Second Chapter: Rules of Christian Conduct in the Love Feast and other social Meetings, and in Domestic Life - - - 60

Appendix (from the Sixth Book of the Greek Constitutions): on Conjugal Life and on Impurities - - - - 72

THE LAW-BOOK OF THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH.

Critical Table of the Canons of both Collections - - - 75

The Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles - - - - 79

NOTES TO THE CHURCH AND HOUSE-BOOK OF THE ANCIENT CHRISTIANS.

To the First Book:

Introductory Note on the critical Works respecting the Ordinances of Baptism - - - - - - - 91

NOTE A. On Chrysostom's Record of the Ancient Order of Baptism in the Church of Antioch - - - - - 92

NOTE B. On the Creed of the Apostles:

Introduction - - - - - - - 92

Page

I. The Creed of the Church of Rome - - - - 95
II. The Creed of the Church of Alexandria - - - 96
III. The Apostles' Creed, according to the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions - - - - - 97

To the Third Book:

Note C. The original Text of the Psalms and Hymns of the Apostolical Church:

Critical Introduction - - - - - - - 98

SECOND PART.

THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION.

BOOK I.

The Christian School and the Baptismal Vow.

I. *The Picture.*

Introductory Remarks: Baptism a Pledge - - - - 105
I. The previous Examination - - - - - 106
II. The Christian Instruction - - - - - 108
III. The Examination - - - - - - 109
IV. The Baptismal Pledge, and the immediate Preparation for it - 110
V. The Admission - - - - - - - 112
Concluding Remarks: Origin and History of Pedo-Baptism, and of the Scholastic Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian - - - - - - 113

II. *The Churches of the present Day reflected in this Picture.*

The Demonism and Formalism of the ancient World, and the Sentimentalism and Amorphism of our Age - - - - 118
The Reality of the Apostolic Age and the Conventionality of the later Church - - - - - - - - 119
The Eastern Church - - - - - - - - 120
The Latin Church - - - - - - - - 121
The Reformers and the Reformed Churches - - - - 121

III. *The Moral Application to the Church of the Future.*

Outlines of the Principles of the Reform of Baptism - - - 125
Proposals for a practical Reform - - - - - 126
The Confirmation of the German Church - - - - 127

BOOK II.

The Constitution and Government of the Christian Church.

I. *The Picture.*

Page

Christianity originally a free and a secret Society, like that of the Jews in Egypt - - - - - - - - 129
Christianity a destructive and a regenerating Element - - 130
Every Town Congregation a Church and a Bishopric - - - 131
The Bishop and the Body of Elders: Origin of Episcopate - - 131
The Town and its Villages, or the first collective Congregation - 132
The Metropolis and smaller Towns around it, second Formations - 132
The principal Town and the Province or Provinces connected with it 133
The organic Life of the Congregation stops short at the first Formation: the larger Unions are merely clerical, and why - - 133
The Relation of the ancient Church to the State - - - 135
No "Character indelebilis" of Clergy, and no Celibacy - - 137
The Diaconate: Deacons and Deaconesses - - - - 137
The Alms, and the Tithes and First-Fruits - - - - 138

II. *The Reflex.*

The Greek and the Roman Churches, each a Corporation of governing Clergy - - - - - - - - - 139
The Difference between them - - - - - - 140
The Principle of National Liberty and Independence claimed by the Reformers - - - - - - - - 140
The constitutional Formations in the Protestant Churches of the Continent - - - - - - - - - 141
The English Church and the Dissenters - - - - 142
The Scotch Church - - - - - - - - 142
The American Formula of the Independence of the Church and State, and the History of this Relation - - - - - 145
Supremacy a spiritual Dictatorship for National Independence in Church Affairs - - - - - - - - 146
General Formula of the Result - - - - - 146

III. *The Practical Application.*

The Principle of the renewed Episcopate with Synods: Idea of the Union - - - - - - - - - 148
The Catholic Element, or the Principles of Universality - - 149
The Cooperation for Missionary Purposes - - - - 149
Untenable Notions of the later Canon Law respecting Ordination and Consecration - - - - - - - - 150

BOOK III.

The Christian Sacrifice and the Liturgy and Order of Service.

I. *The Picture.*

Page
The organic Nature and Dispositions of the Service - - - 153
The Christian Hymns - - - - - - 156
The Offering of the Gifts, or the Symbolical Sacrifice - - 156
The real, the spiritual Sacrifice, and its double liturgical Expression - 158
The present Form of the Lord's Prayer is the ancient Prayer of Con e-
cration, or the Prayer over Givers and Gifts - - - 160
Invocation and Lord's Prayer always said, and before the Communion 162
The Element of Thanksgiving and that of Invocation, as the Object of
the free Prayer of Consecration - - - - - 162
The Eucharistic Prayer included a Commemoration of the Dead, of
which the principal Element was that of Thanks - - 164

II. *The Reflex.*

I. The Reflex of the Worship of the Eastern Church in the Mirror of
the Apostolic Age - - - - - - - 166
The Traces of the Development of the Eucharistic Church Prayers
out of the Lord's Prayer and the free Prayer of Consecration - 167
II. The Reflex of the Communion Service of the Gauls of Spain,
of Milan, and of Africa - - - - - - 169
III. The Reflex of the Communion Service of the Church of Rome - 170
IV. The general Character of the Communion Services of the present
Byzantine and Roman Churches - - - - - 171
V. The Service of the Reformed Churches - - - - 173
Recapitulation of the Reflex of the Byzantine and Roman Eucharistic
Service - - - - - - - - - 173
The Reflex of the Reform of the Service in the Church of England in
general - - - - - - - - - 174
1. The First Communion Book of Edward the Sixth - - 181
2. The Second Book of Edward the Sixth - - - 186
3. Laud's Communion Service for Scotland - - - 187
4. The present established Communion Service of the Church of
England (1559, 1604, 1662) - - - - - 190
5. The present Communion Service of the Episcopal Church of
Scotland - - - - - - - - 194
6. The Liturgy, and, in particular, the Communion Service, of the
Episcopal Church of the United States - - - 197
Summary of the results of the Protestant Measures for amending the
Liturgy, and restoring the Christian Sacrifice - - - 199

III. *The Practical Application.*

Page

The Fallacy and Danger of the Attempt to transfer Forms of the Greek and Latin Church authoritatively to our own Use, exemplified by the Collects, the Prophetic Lessons, and the Ecclesiastical Year - 205
Principles for right Use of Ancient Elements - - - 208
The Psalmody, and the distinguishing Excellences of the English Liturgy - - - - - - - - - 209
The Excellence of the German Church as to Hymns and Hymnody - 210
The Principles of Sacred and Church Music - - - - 211
The Principles of Church Architecture - - - - 211
The leading Principle: the Restoration of the Scriptural Self-Sacrifice - - - - - - - - 212

IV. *The Picture and Import of the other Ceremonies of the Ancient Church.*

Marriage and Burial Service - - - - - 214

BOOK IV.

THE RULES OF CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE CONGREGATIONAL, SOCIAL, AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS.

The Congregational Life - - - - - - - 217
The Origin of Fast-Days - - - - - - - 218
The Observation of Sabbath and Sunday - - - - - 218
The Love-Feasts - - - - - - - - 219
The Sign of the Cross - - - - - - - 220
The Abstinence from Sacrificial Meats and from Fornication - 220
The Relation between Master and Servant, and the Import of Apostolic Reform - - - - - - - - 221
Marriage and Divorce - - - - - - - 223
The Christian Woman - - - - - - - 224
The Principle of Moral Responsibility the true test of Apostolic Christianity - - - - - - - - 224
Conclusion: Final Formula for the Development - - - 225

The Law-Book of the Ante-Nicene Church.

The original Shape of the First Collection, and its gradual Enlargement - - - - - - - - - 227
The Second Collection - - - - - - - 228
The general Results, and the Contrast of Old and New Canon Law - 228
Retrospective View: The Regeneration of the World in the Protestant States. — The Law of Divorce and the Law of Slavery - 231

NOTES TO THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION.

Page

NOTE A. The three Passages of Origen respecting Baptism - - 245

NOTE B. Liturgical Formularies of the German Lutheran Churches for Confirmation:

I. A collective Formulary, compiled from the Ancient Agendas, principally from that of Austria, of 1571 - - - 246

II. The Order of Confirmation, as agreed upon for the German Congregation at Jerusalem - - - - - - 252

NOTE C. The History of the 20th of the Thirty-Nine Articles - 255

NOTE D. Works on the English Church, and on modern Liturgies in general, referred to - - - - - - 256

THIRD PART.

THE APOLOGY OF HIPPOLYTUS; OR, THE LIFE, CRITICISM, AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS.

The Exordium: Hippolytus represents his general Grievance, and states his Case - - - - - - - - - 265

Reasons why Hippolytus wishes to be judged by the English People: his general Impressions of England and the English, and his Disputes about them with the Successor of Irenæus at Lyons - 271

His Misgivings that the English will find no time for him - - 275

His Plan of Defence: Conclusion of the Exordium - - - 276

Hippolytus tells his Personal History: his Wife Chloe and his son Anteros - - - - - - - - - 277

He relates the Dispute with his learned English Friends respecting the genuine Text of the New Testament - - - - 281

How in his Conversations he explained, and in part defended, his allegorical Interpretations against certain Interpreters of Daniel and the Apocalypse - - - - - - - - 284

Hippolytus is interrupted by Vociferations: he defends himself for having mentioned the Opinion of the German Critics on the Age of the Book of Daniel, as deserving to be examined - - 288

He continues to explain the Feelings of the Ancient Christians respecting the End of the World, and contrasts them with the Views of a certain English School, and their Prophecies - - 290

Hippolytus relates how a Divine of another School attacked his Orthodoxy, and regrets that he did not know the Creeds and Decrees of the Councils, which could have guided him - - - 293

Page

What he thinks of the Books which his English Friends had given him, and of the Church-Creeds - - - - - - 294

How he expressed Doubts respecting the Orthodoxy of his English Friends; and how, after defending himself against the Reproach of Germanizing, he made them agree to enter into a philosophical Discussion on the Nicene Creed - - - - - - 295

How he showed them that they did not believe as they ought in what the Creeds say of the Father and of the Creation, and of the Infinite - - - - - - - - - 297

How he expressed his Doubts as to their Belief in the Second Article of the Nicene Creed, and in what is said of the Word and of the Eternal Sonship - - - - - - - - 299

What he said when they seemed afraid that certain Truths might be dangerous - - - - - - - - - 300

How he intimated still more strongly his Doubts as to their genuine Belief in the Spirit and in the Church; and how, after having defended his own Orthodoxy, he manifested his deep Anxiety for them - - - - - - - - - - 302

How they were shocked to hear him say such things; and how he questioned them about their Notion concerning the Inspiration of the Scriptures, and then explained the much higher View of the Ancient Church in that respect, and how the rational Interpretation of Scripture is the spiritual, the irrational the materialistic - 307

How his Christian Friends desired to know his View respecting the present Controversy about Baptismal Regeneration, and how he simply stated the View of the Ancient Church on Baptism - 312

How they expressed their Concern that he had spoken of Sacramental Sacrifice, and how he entered with them into a Discussion respecting the Nature of the Sacrifice and of the Eucharist - 314

How he retorted this Point upon them, and proved to them that their Controversies with th Church of Rome turned on a Question entirely alien to the Ancient Church, namely, how the Sacramental Elements are affected by the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and that the Ancient Church was more adverse than they are to the idea of Transubstantiation - - - - - - - 319

A last Question of a young English Friend - - - - 325

Hippolytus having exhausted his time, and obtained leave to continue. completes his Defence: he shows, first, that he is not a Germanizer, but that the German Divines understand very well the Philosophical Questions discussed by the Ancient Church. He complains of some of them - - - - - - - - 326

Page

He defends himself against the charge of not being of a good Christian Temper, and of having expressed himself with Bitterness of Heart against the Bishop of Rome, and having shown himself very exclusive with respect to Christian Opinions and Communities - 331

How, respecting the Exclusiveness, he turns the tables upon them, and reproves them for their Intolerance - - - - - 333

The Peroration: The concluding Address of Hippolytus to his Judges: his own and his Fellow Martyrs' Exhortation to the Christians of this Age, not to be afraid of the Struggle for the Liberty of Conscience and of the Spirit, which must precede the final Victory of the Kingdom of God upon Earth - - - - - 334

EDITOR'S NOTES TO THE APOLOGY OF HIPPOLYTUS.

NOTE TO TITLE. The Ides of August, the Date of the Deposition of the Remains of St. Hippolytus - - - - - 339

NOTE 1. The Three Hippolytuses whom the Church of Rome has made out of the One - - - - - - - 340

NOTE 2. The present Successor of Irenæus - - - - - 341

NOTE 3. The Dean of the Sacred College - - - - - 342

NOTE 4. The Works and Monuments of Protestantism - - - 342

NOTE 5. Cicero's Prophecy of the English Constitution, and of its History - - - - - - - - - 342

NOTE 6. The Wife and Children of St. Hippolytus - - - - 344

NOTE 7. The Inscription of Heron, belonging to the Temple of Serapis at Portus, of the time of Hippolytus - - - - 344

NOTE 8. Callistus' Residence in Trastevere - - - - - 345

NOTE 9. Hippolytus on the paramount Authority of Scripture - 345

NOTE 10. The Punctuation of the first Verses of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel - - - - - - - - 345

NOTE 11. The Canon of the New Testament in the Roman Church in the Age of Hippolytus - - - - - - - 346

NOTE 12. The Belief of Hippolytus in the Facts of Clairvoyance, and his wise Judgment upon this Subject - - - - 346

NOTE 13. The Passage of Hippolytus as to the Sacrifice in the Eucharist 346

NOTE 14. The Christian's only Sacrifice the spiritual one - - 347

NOTE 15. The ancient Christians did not talk Christ and Christianity, but lived them - - - - - - - 347

NOTE 16. The Martyrs died for the Liberty of Mankind - - 348

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE. On the Forebodings among the Christians of the Second and Third Centuries respecting the approaching End of the World, and a Renewal of Mankind and Human Society - - - - - - - - - 348

PART I.

CHURCH- AND HOUSE-BOOK

OF THE

ANCIENT CHRISTIANS,

AND

LAW-BOOK

OF

THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH.

APPENDIX.

ESSAYS ON THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE AND WORSHIP, AND ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

Introductory Essay.

Page

General View of the Consciousness and Life of the Ancient Church, respecting the Sacrifice and the Ecclesiastical Law and Government - - - - - - - - - 357

First Section. — *Essays on the Christian Sacrifice and Worship.*

I. Theses on the Eucharist which can be proved historically - 365
II. The Epochs of the History of the Christian Sacrifice and the Eucharist - - - - - - - - 369
III. The Nature of the Christian Sacrifice - - - - 384

Second Section. — *Essays on the Constitution of the Ancient Church.*

I. The Apostolical Constitutions; their general Character, Origin, and Importance - - - - - - - - 395
Appendix on the Apostolical Canons of the Codex Barberinus and the Petersburgh MS., and on the Discoveries and Researches of Bickell and Zenker respecting the Syrian Text of the Constitutions - - - - - - - - - 409
II. The Work of Hippolytus on the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and traces of this Work in the Apostolical Constitutions - - 412
III. General Results respecting the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons:
A. General critical Results - - - - - - 418
B. General Results for the Philosophical History of the Age of Hippolytus - - - - - - - - 421
I. As to the Genuineness and historical Importance of the Apostolical Ordinances - - - - - 421
II. As to the Canons of the Apostles, and the ante-Nicene System of Church Government - - - - - 422

Appendix on the Christian Sacrifice.

(Ch. V. VI. VII.)

The principal passages of Irenæus on the Christian Sacrifice:
I. Passages in his great work of the Heresies - - - 425
II. The Pfaffian Fragments - - - - - 428

Preface to the Fourth Volume of the First Edition - - - 431

THE

Church- and House-Book

OF THE

Ancient Christians.

THE TEXT IN FOUR BOOKS.

THE FIRST BOOK.

Ordinances respecting the Reception, the Instruction, the Pledge, and the Admission of the Catechumens: or, the Instruction and Baptism of the Ancient Church.

THE SECOND BOOK.

Ordinances respecting the Offices of the Congregation: or, the Government and Constitutions of the Ancient Church.

THE THIRD BOOK.

The Order and Formularies of the Service: or, the Christian Sacrifice and Worship, and the Liturgy of the Ancient Church.

THE FOURTH BOOK.

Rules of general Christian Conduct for all Members of the Congregation: or, the domestic, congregational, and social Life of the early Christians.

FIRST BOOK.

THE RECEPTION, THE INSTRUCTION, THE PLEDGE, AND THE ADMISSION

OF

The Catechumens:

OR,

THE CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION AND THE BAPTISM OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

THIS BOOK CONTAINETH:

I. How they who require to be instructed are to be examined before they are admitted.

II. How they who are admitted are instructed.

III. The Moral Catechism, or the Doctrine of the Two Ways.

IV. How, after a Year's Instruction, the Catechumens undergo an Examination, and their Conduct is investigated before they are admitted to hear the Gospel.

V. How they are dismissed with a Blessing, after the Sermon.

VI. The ancient Prayer for the Catechumens of the Church of Antioch, as recorded by St. Chrysostom.

VII. That a Catechumen, who suffereth Death for his Faith, hath received the Baptism in his Blood.

VIII. How, after the Course of Instruction hath terminated, the Catechumens, who are to be admitted, are separated and sealed, for being baptized on Easter.

IX. How the Water is to be prepared, and the general Order of Baptism.
X. How the Oil for the Anointing is prepared.
XI. How they are to renounce Satan, and be anointed, and then say the Creed.
XII. How they are anointed by the Presbyter, and clothed and conducted into the Church.
XIII. How the Bishop and the Elders bless and anoint their Heads with the Chrisma; and how the Baptized give the Peace.
XIV. How they receive the Eucharist and the Milk and Honey.

APPENDIX.

I. Different forms of the Apostolic Creed:
1. According to the Church of Rome;
2. According to the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions.
II. Ordinance that the Baptized is to pray the Lord's Prayer, as Priest, before the People.
III. The Order of Baptism in the Church of Jerusalem, as recorded by Cyrillus.

Book I.

1. *How they who require to be instructed are to be examined before they are admitted.*

THOSE that first come to the Mystery of Godliness, let them be brought to the Bishop, or to the Presbyters, [by the Deacons,] and let them be examined as to the causes wherefore they come to the Word of the Lord: and let those who bring them exactly inquire about their Character, and give them their Testimony. Let their manners, and their life, be inquired into; and whether they be Slaves or Freemen: and if any one be a Slave, let him be asked who is his master. If he be Slave to one of the Believers, let his master be asked if he can give him a good character. If he cannot, let him be rejected until he show himself to be worthy to his master: but if he does give him a good character, let him be admitted. But if he be Slave to an Heathen, let him be taught to please his master, *that the Word be not blasphemed*. If then he have a wife, or a Woman hath a husband, let them be taught to be content with each other, and to live soberly; but if they be unmarried, let them learn not to commit fornication, but to enter into lawful marriage; but if his Master be one of the faithful, and knows that he is guilty of fornication, and yet does not give him a wife, or to the Woman a husband, let him be separated.

But if any one hath a Demon, let him indeed be taught Godliness, but not received into communion before he be cleansed; yet if death be near, let him be received.

If any one be a Maintainer of Harlots, let him either leave off to prostitute women, or else let him be rejected.

If a Whore come, let her leave off whoredom, or else let her be rejected.

If a Maker of Idols come, let him either leave off his employment, or let him be rejected.

If one belonging to the Theatre come, whether it be man or woman, or a charioteer, or a fighter in single combat, or a racer, or an exhibitor of a show of gladiators, or an Olympic gamester, or one that plays on the flute or on the lute at these games, or a dancing-master, or a keeper of a public house, either let them leave off their employments, or let them be rejected.

If a Soldier come, let him be taught to *do no injustice, to accuse no man falsely, and to be content with his allotted stipend;* if he submit to these rules let him be received, but if he refuse them, let him be rejected.

He that is guilty of Sins not to be named, a sodomite, an effeminate person, a magician, an enchanter, an astrologer, a diviner, an user of magic verses, a juggler, a mountebank, one that makes amulets, a charmer, a soothsayer, a fortune-teller, an observer of palmistry, he that when he meets you observes defects in the eyes, or feet of the birds, or cats, or noises, or symbolical sounds; let these be proved for some time, for this sort of wickedness is hard to be washed away; and if they leave off those practices, let them be received, but if they will not agree to that, let them be rejected.

Let a Concubine, who is servant to an unbeliever, and confines herself to her master alone, be received; but if she be incontinent with others, let her be rejected.

If one of the Believers hath a Concubine, if she be a bond-servant, let him leave off that way, and contract a legal matrimony; if she be a free woman, let him marry her in a lawful manner; if he doth not, let him be rejected; if she liveth with a believing Servant, let her leave off, or be rejected.

He that followeth the Gentile Customs, or Jewish Fables, either let him reform, or let him be rejected.

If any one followeth the Sports of the Theatre, their huntings,

or horse-races, or combats, either let him leave them off, or let him be rejected. (Greek Constitut. book VIII. Compare Copt. Can. book III. can. 4.)

If we have omitted anything, the circumstances will teach you, for we have all the Spirit of God. (Copt. Can. conclusion of can. 41.)

II. *How they who are admitted are instructed.*

HE who is to be catechized, let him be catechize d Three Years: but if any one be diligent, and has a good will to his business, let him be admitted; for it is not the Length of Time, but the Course of Life that is judged. (Greek Const. book VIII.; Copt. Can. II. 42.)

He that teacheth, although he be one of the Laity, yet if he be skilful in the Word, and grave in his manners, let him teach; for, *they shall be all taught of God.* (Greek Const. book VIII.)

III. *The Moral Catechism, or the Doctrine of the Two Ways.*

THERE are two ways, one is the Way of Life, and the other is the Way of Death: and there is much difference in these two ways. But the Way of Life is, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, who created thee, and thou shalt glorify Him who redeemed thee from death; for this is the first Commandment.

But the second is, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two Commandments hang the Law and the Prophets.

Every thing that thou wouldest not should be done to thee, that do not thou also to another; that is, what thou hatest do not to another.

Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not commit fornication; thou shalt not pollute a youth; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not be a sorcerer; thou shalt not use divination; thou shalt not cause a woman to miscarry, neither if she has brought forth a child shalt thou kill it; thou shalt not covet any thing that is thy neighbour's; thou shalt not bear false witness; thou shalt not speak evil of any one, neither shalt thou think evil; thou shalt not be double-minded, neither shalt thou be double-tongued, for a double tongue is a snare of death; thy speech shall not be vain, neither tending to a lie; thou shalt not be covetous, neither rapacious, nor an hypocrite, nor of an evil heart, nor proud; thou shalt not speak an evil word against thy neighbour; thou shalt not hate any man, but thou shalt reprove some, and shalt have mercy upon others; thou shalt pray for some, and shalt love others as thy own soul.

My Son, flee from all Evil, and hate all Evil. Be not angry, because Anger leads to Murder, for Anger is an evil Demon. Be not emulous, neither be contentious, nor quarrelsome, for Envy proceeds from these.

My Son, be not of unlawful Desires, because Desire leadeth to Fornication, drawing men to it involuntarily; for Lust is a Demon. For if the evil Spirit of Anger is united with that of Lust, they destroy those who shall receive them. And the Way of the evil Spirit is the Sin of the Soul. For when he spyeth a little way, quietly entering in he will make the way broad; and he will take with him all other evil Spirits; he will go to that Soul and will not leave the man to meditate at all, lest he should see the truth. Let a Restraint be put upon your Anger, and curb it with not a little care, that you may cast it behind you, lest it should precipitate you into some evil deed. For Wrath and evil Desire, if they be suffered always to remain, are Demons. And when they have Dominion over a man they change him in Soul, that he may be prepared for a great deed: and when they have led him into unrighteous acts, they deride him, and will rejoice in the destruction of that man.

My Son, be not the Utterer of an evil Expression, nor of Obscenity, neither be thou haughty, for of these things come Adulteries.

My Son, be not a Diviner, for Divination leadeth to Idolatry; neither be thou an Enchanter, nor an Astrologer, nor a Magician, nor an Idolater; neither teach them nor hear them; for from these things proceedeth Idolatry.

My Son, be not a Liar, because a Falsehood leadeth to Blasphemy. Neither be thou a Lover of Silver nor a Lover of Vainglory, for from these Thefts arise.

My Son, be not a Murmurer, because Repining leadeth a man to Blasphemy. Be thou not harsh, nor a thinker of evil, for of all these things Contentions are begotten. But be thou meek, for the meek shall inherit the earth. And be thou also merciful, peaceable, compassionate, cleansed in thy heart from all evil. Be thou sincere, gentle, good; trembling at the words of God, which thou hast heard, and do thou keep them. Do not exalt thyself, neither shalt thou give thy heart to pride, but thou shalt increase more and more with the just and humble. Every Evil which cometh upon thee receive as Good, knowing that nothing shall come upon thee but from God.

My Son, he who declareth to thee the Word of God, and hath been the cause of life to thee, and hath given to thee the holy Seal which is in the Lord, thou shalt love him as the apple of thine eyes, and remember him by night and day; thou shalt honour him as of the Lord: for in that place in which the word of power is, there is the Lord; and thou shalt seek his face daily, him, and those who remain of the Saints, that thou mayest rest thee on their words: for he who is united to the Saints shall be holy.

Thou shalt honour him according to thy power, by the Sweat of thy Brow, and by the Labour of thy Hands: for if the Lord hath made thee meet that he might impart to thee spiritual food, and spiritual drink, and eternal life, by him; it becometh thee also the more, that thou shouldest impart to him the food which perisheth and is temporal; for the Labourer is worthy of his

Hire. For it is written: Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn; neither doth any one plant a vineyard and not eat of the fruit thereof.

Thou shalt not cause Schisms: thou shalt reconcile in peace those who contend with one another. Judge in Righteousness without acceptation of Persons. Reprove him who hath sinned, for his Sin. Suffer not Wealth to prevail before God, neither justify the Unworthy, for beauty profiteth not; but righteous judgment before all. Doubt not in thy Prayer, thinking whether what thou hast asked of Him will be or not. Let it not, indeed, be, that when thou receivest thou stretchest out thine hand, but when thou shouldest give thou drawest thy hand to thee. But if thou hast at hand, thou shalt give for the Redemption of thy Sins. Thou shalt not doubt, thou shalt give; neither when thou hast given shalt thou murmur, knowing there is a reward of God. Thou shalt not turn away from the Needy, but shalt communicate with the Needy in all things: thou shalt not say, these things are mine alone. If ye communicate with one another in those things which are incorruptible, how much rather should ye not do it in those things which are corruptible?

I beseech you, my Brethren, while you have time, and he who asketh remains with you, if you are able to do good to them, do not fail in any thing to any one, which you have the power to do.

For the Day of the Lord draweth nigh, in which every thing that is seen shall be dissolved, and the Wicked shall be destroyed with it; for the Lord cometh, and his reward is with him.

Be ye lawgivers to your own selves; be ye Teachers to yourselves alone, as God hath taught you. Thou shalt keep those things which thou hast received; thou shalt not take from them, neither shalt thou add to them. (Introduction to the Coptic Canons, book I.)

IV. *How, after the first Course of Instruction, the Catechumens undergo an Examination, and their Conduct is investigated before they are admitted to hear the Gospel, and how long their Instruction is to last.*

WHEN they have chosen those appointed to receive Baptism, let their Life be inquired into, whether they have lived in Chastity during the time of being Catechumens: whether they have honoured the Widows; whether they have visited the Sick; whether they have fulfilled every good work. And if those who have introduced them have witnessed to them that they have done thus, let them hear the Gospel. Let the Catechumens be Three Years hearing the Word; but if one hath been diligent and persevereth well in the work, the Time shall not decide, but the Application alone shall entirely decide it. (Copt. Can. b. II. 45ª. 42.)

V. *How they are dismissed with a Blessing, after the Sermon.*

WHEN the Teacher hath ended the Sermon, let the Catechumens pray by themselves apart, and the faithful apart. And let the Women stand praying in a place in the Church, apart by themselves, whether the faithful women or the women Catechumens. And when they conclude praying, let them not give the Salutation (Peace) before they are pure.

Let the Believers salute one another, the men with the men alone, and the women with the women. But let not a man salute a woman. And let all the Women not cover their heads with a costly Veil, but with a fine cloth of cotton alone, for this is their veil.

When the Teacher after the Prayer shall lay his hands upon the Catechumens, let him pray, dismissing them; whether he be an Ecclesiastic or a Layman who delivereth it, let him do so. (Copt. Can. b. II. 43, 44.)

VI. *The ancient Prayers of the Church of Antioch for the Catechumens, as recorded by St. Chrysostom.*

(The Catechumens pray silently, the Congregation standeth.)

LET us pray earnestly for the Catechumens, that the all-loving and all-merciful God may hear their Prayer: that He may open the ears of their hearts, in order that they may perceive what no eye hath seen, no ear hath heard, and what is not come into the heart of any one (1 Cor. ii. 9.); that He may teach them the word of truth, and that He may sow in their hearts the seed of the fear of God: that He may strengthen the faith in their hearts: that He may reveal to them the Gospel of righteousness: that He may give them a godlike mind, pure thoughts, and a virtuous life, always to think what is of God, to meditate what is of God, to care for what is of God.

Let us pray still more earnestly for them: that He may preserve them from every evil and wicked deed, from every devilish sin, and from every deceit of the enemy: that He may make them worthy, at due time, of the laver of regeneration and of the forgiveness of sins: that He may bless their going in and their going out, their whole life, their houses, and their families: that He may increase and bless their children, that He may bring them to the right age, and make them wise: that He may thus direct all which they propose to do, as may be most expedient for them.

The Deacon to the Catechumens:

Rise!

Address to the standing Catechumens:

Pray for the Angel of Peace, ye Catechumens, that what you propose may be fulfilled in peace.

Pray that this day and all the days of your life may be peaceful, and that your end may be Christian.

Recommend yourselves to the living God and to His Christ. Bend your heads.

(*They receive the blessing: the whole congregation saying:* Amen.)

(St. Chrysost. 2d Homily on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.)

VII. *That a Catechumen who suffereth Death for the Faith, hath received Baptism in his Blood.*

IF a Catechumen has been apprehended for the Name of the Lord, let him not hesitate to give the Testimony; for if they have taken him by violence that they may kill him, he will be justified and receive the Forgiveness of his Sins; for he will have received Baptism in his own Blood. (Copt. Can. b. II. 44.)

VIII. *How, after the Course of Instruction has terminated, those Catechumens who are to be admitted are separated and sealed for being baptized at Easter.*

AND when they shall be separated, let them lay hands upon them on that day, exorcising them.

And when the day approacheth on which they shall be baptized, let the Bishop exorcise each one of them, that he may know that they are pure. But if any one is not good, or is not clean, let them put him apart, that he may not hear the Word with the Believers; for it is not possible that a stranger can ever be concealed. Let them teach those appointed for Baptism that they should wash and be made free; that they should be made

so on the fifth Sabbath (viz. on the Saturday in the fifth week of Lent, the Saturday before Palm Sunday).

Let them, who are to receive Baptism, fast on the Preparation of the Sabbath (Friday). But on the Sabbath, when those who shall receive have been gathered together in one place, by the advice of the Bishop, let them all be commanded to pray and to kneel; and when he hath laid his hand upon them, let him exorcise every strange Spirit to flee from them, and not to return into them from that time. And when he hath finished exorcising, let him breathe on them; and when he hath sealed their foreheads, and their ears, and the opening of their mouths, let him raise them up; and let them watch all the night, reading to them, and exhorting them. And let those who shall receive Baptism not take any thing but that alone, which each one shall bring in for the Thanksgiving; for it is becoming him who is worthy, that he should bring in his Offering immediately. (Copt. Can. b. II. 45^{b}.)

IX. *How the Water is to be prepared, and the general Order of Baptism.*

AND at the time of the Crowing of the Cock let them first pray over the Water. Let the Water be drawn into the font, or flow into it. And let it be thus, if they have no scarcity. But if there be a scarcity, let them pour the Water which shall be found into the font; and let them undress themselves, and the Young shall be first baptized. And after the adult Men have been baptized, at the last the Women, having loosed all their hair, and having laid aside their ornaments of gold and silver which were on them. Let not any one take a strange garment with him into the Water. (Copt. Can. b. II. 46.)

X. *How the Oil for the Anointing is prepared.*

AND at the time which is appointed for the Baptism let the Bishop give thanks over the Oil, which, putting into a vessel, he shall call the Oil of Thanksgiving. Again, he shall take the other Oil, and exorcising over it, he shall call it the Oil of Exorcism. And a Deacon shall bear the Oil of Exorcism, and stand on the left hand of the Presbyter. Another Deacon shall take the Oil of Thanksgiving, and stand on the right hand of the Presbyter. (Copt. Can. b. II. 46.)

XI. *How they are to renounce Satan and be anointed: and then say the Creed.*

AND when the Presbyter has taken hold of each one of those who are about to receive Baptism, let him command him to renounce, saying: "I will renounce thee, Satan, and all thy service, and all thy works." And when he has renounced all these, let him anoint him with the Oil of Exorcism, saying: "Let every Spirit depart from thee." And let the Bishop or the Presbyter receive him thus undressed, to place him in the Water of Baptism. Also let the Deacon go with him into the Water, and let him say to him, helping him that he may say: "I believe in the only true God, the Father Almighty, and in His only begotten Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, and in the Holy Spirit, the quickener."

And let him who receiveth Baptism repeat after all these: "I believe thus." And he who bestoweth it shall lay his hand upon the head of him who receiveth, dipping him Three Times, confessing these things each time. And afterwards let him say again: "Dost thou believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God the Father; that he became man in a wonderful

manner for us, in an incomprehensible unity, by his Holy Spirit, of Mary the Holy Virgin, without the seed of man, and that he was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and died of his own will once for our Redemption, and rose on the third day, loosing the bands of Death; that he ascended up into Heaven, and sate on the right hand of his good Father on high, and that he cometh again to judge the Living and the Dead at the appearing of Him and his kingdom? And dost thou believe in the Holy good Spirit, and quickener, who wholly purifieth in the Holy Church?" Let him again say: "I believe." (Copt. Can. b. II. 46.)

XII. *How they are anointed by the Presbyter, and clothed and conducted into the Church.*

AND let them go up out of the Water, and the Presbyter shall anoint him with the Oil of Thanksgiving: saying, "I anoint thee with holy anointing oil, in the name of Jesus Christ." Thus he shall anoint every one of the rest, and clothe them as the rest, and they shall enter into the Church. (Copt. Can. b. II. 46.)

XIII. *How the Bishop and the Elders bless and anoint the Heads of the Catechumens with the Chrism; and how the Baptized give the Peace.*

LET the Bishop lay his hand upon them with affection, saying: "Lord God, as thou hast made these worthy to receive the forgiveness of their sins in the world to come, make them worthy to be filled with thy Holy Spirit, and send upon them thy grace, that they may serve thee according to thy will, for Thine is the glory, *thou who art* the Father and the Son and

the Holy Spirit, in the Holy Church, now and always, and for ever and ever." And he shall pour of the Oil of Thanksgiving in his hand, and put his hand upon the head of each, saying: "I anoint *thee* with *the holy anointing* oil, from God the Father Almighty, and Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit." And he shall seal upon his forehead, saluting him. And he shall say: "The Lord be with thee." He, who hath been sealed, shall answer: "And with thy spirit." Each one (of the Presbyters) doing thus with the remaining. And let all the People pray together. And all those who receive Baptism shall be praying; let them say Peace with their mouths. (Copt. Can. b. II. 46.)

XIV. *How they receive the Eucharist and the Milk and Honey.*

LET the Deacons bring the Eucharist to the Bishop, and he shall give thanks over the Bread, because of the similitude of the Flesh of Christ, and over the Cup of Wine, because it is the Blood of Christ, which was poured out for every one who believeth on him; and Milk and Honey mixed, for fulfilling the Promises to the Fathers, because he hath said: "I will give you a land flowing with milk and honey." This is the Flesh of Christ, which was given for us, that those who believe on him should be nourished by it as Infants; that Bitterness of Heart may be dissipated by the Sweetness of the Word. All these things the Bishop shall discourse to those who shall receive Baptism.

And when the Bishop hath divided the Bread, let him give a portion to each of them, saying: "This is the Bread of heaven, the Body of Christ Jesus." Let him who receiveth it answer: "Amen."

And if there are not more Presbyters there, let the Deacons take the Cup, and they shall stand in order, that they may give

them the blood of Christ Jesus our Lord, and the Milk, and the Honey. Let him who giveth the Cup say: "This is the Blood of Christ Jesus our Lord;" and he who receiveth it again shall answer: "Amen."

And when these things have been done, let every one hasten to do all good things, and to please God, and to take care to live in integrity, being diligent in the Church, doing those things which they have been taught, proceeding in the service of God. (Copt. Can. b. II. 46.)

APPENDIX.

I.

Different Forms of the Creed.

1.

According to the Church of Rome.

I BELIEVE in God the Father Almighty:
And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord:
Who was by the Holy Ghost born of the Virgin Mary,
Suffered under Pontius Pilate,
Was crucified and buried,
The third day he rose again from the Dead,
He ascended into Heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father,
From thence he shall come to judge the Quick and the Dead.
I believe in the Holy Ghost:
The holy Church:
The Forgiveness of Sins:
The Resurrection of the Body. Amen.

2.

According to the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions (doubtful).

I BELIEVE in one, uncreated, the only true, Almighty God
the Father of Christ:
Creator and Maker of all things:
And in the Lord Jesus Christ,
his only-begotten Son
the First-born of the whole Creation [not created]
who before the Ages was begotten
by the good will of the Father
by whom all things are made in Heaven and on Earth, visible and invisible:
who in the last Days descended from Heaven and took Flesh,
and was born of the holy Virgin Mary:
and conversed holily according to the Laws of his God and Father,
and was crucified under Pontius Pilate,
and died for us,
and after he had suffered rose the third Day from the Dead,
ascended into Heaven,
and sitteth at the right hand of the Father,
and again is to come with Glory
in the Consummation of Time
to judge the Quick and the Dead
of whose Kingdom there will be no end:
And in the Holy Ghost, the Comforter,
who wrought in all the holy Men from the beginning of the World,

and afterwards was sent to the Apostles
by the Father, according to the promise
of our Lord Jesus Christ,
and after the Apostles to all Believers:
And in the holy Catholic Church,
in the Resurrection of the Flesh,
in the Remission of the Sins,
in the Kingdom of Heaven,
and in the Life of the World to come.

II.

An Ordinance that the Baptized is to say aloud the Lord's Prayer, as Priest, before the People.

LET him pray as a Son to the Father, and say, as if speaking in the name of all the Christian Congregation present:

Our Father which art in Heaven: hallowed be thy Name: thy Kingdom come: thy Will be done in Earth as it is done in Heaven: give us this Day our daily Bread: and forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors: and lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from Evil: for thine is the Kingdom and the Power and the Glory now and for ever. Amen.

(Greek Const. book III. 17.)

III.

The Order of Baptism in the Church of Jerusalem, as recorded by Cyril, in his Sermons to the newly Baptized (Catecheses Mystag. I. III.), *preached in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, about* 350 *or* 360.

YOU went first into the Porch (the Baptistery), and, being placed towards the West, you heard the Command, to stretch out your hands, and to renounce Satan, as if he was present . . . . and to say: I renounce Satan . . . . and all his Works . . . . and all his Pomp, and all his Service.

After this thou wast turned towards the East, and wast ordered to say: I believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and in a Baptism of repentance.

All this was done in the Porch. But when you were entered into the inner house, you took off your garment: and thus you were anointed with the Holy Oil from the top of the Head to the sole of the Feet . . . . Then you were conducted to the Font of the Holy Baptism, and every one of you was asked: whether he believed in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost? And you made the sound Confession of Faith, and were three times immersed into the Water. . . .

SECOND BOOK.

The Constitution of the early Church.

THIS BOOK CONTAINETH:

A. *The First Set of Ordinances of the Church of Alexandria respecting the Clergy.* — Coptic Collection, first book; and Ethiopic Collection.

I. How a Bishop is to be elected, and what is required of him.
II. That the Bishop is to ordain two, or rather three, Presbyters.
III. How the Reader is to be proved, and what is required of him.
IV[a]. How the Deacon is to be proved, and what is required of him.
IV[b]. Additional Ordinances respecting the Deacons.
V. How three Widows are to be appointed, and what are their duties.
VI. For what purpose Deaconesses are to be appointed.

B. *The Second Set of Ordinances of the Church of Alexandria respecting the Clergy.* — Coptic Collection, second book.

I. How a Bishop is to be elected and ordained, and how he is to say the Thanksgiving.
I*. The same, according to the Ethiopic Collection.
II*. How a Presbyter is to be ordained, according to the Ethiopic Collection.

II. The same, according to the Coptic Collection.
III. How a Deacon is to be appointed, and what is his office.
IV. In what a Presbyter differeth from an Elder.
V. That a Confessor needeth no Ordination to become Deacon or Presbyter.
VI. How a Reader is to be appointed.
VII. How Widows are to be appointed.
VIII. How Virgins are to be appointed.
IX. What is to be done with him who hath the Gifts of Healing.

C. *The Third Set of Ordinances of the Church of Alexandria respecting the Clergy.* — Coptic Collection, fourth book.

I. How a Bishop is to be elected, proved, and ordained.
II. How the Bishop is to ordain a Presbyter or Deacon.
III. How he is to appoint [Subdeacons and] Readers and Deaconnesses.
IV. That a Confessor needeth no Ordination, unless made a Bishop.
V. Against arrogant and presumptuous Confessors.
VI. Virgins not to be ordained.
VII. Precautions in the Appointment of Widows.
VIII. Precautions as to persons who have the Gift of Healing the Possessed.
IX. Additional Ordinance as to the case of a Bishop having been ordained by one Bishop only.
X. General Definitions of the peculiar Right and Power of the different Members of the Clergy.

APPENDIX.

A. The Requisites and Duties of a Bishop according to the Third Book of the Greek Apostolical Constitutions.
B. On the Marriage of Clergy.

Book II.

A.

THE FIRST SET

OF

Ordinances of the Church of Alexandria respecting the Clergy.

(Coptic Collection, first book; Ethiopic Collection.)

I. *How a Bishop is to be elected, and what is required of him.*

IF there should be a Place having a few faithful Men in it, before the multitude increase, who shall be able to make a Dedication to Pious Uses for the Bishop, to the extent of Twelve Men, let them write to the Churches round about the place, in which the multitude of the believers (assemble and) are established.

That Three chosen Men in that Place may come, that they may examine with diligence him who has been thought worthy of this Degree, whether he have a good Reputation among the People, as being guiltless, without anger, a lover of the poor, prudent, wise, not given to wine, not a fornicator, not covetous, not a contemner, not partial, and the like of these things.

If he have not a Wife it is a good thing; but if he have married a Wife, having Children, let him abide with her, continuing steadfast in every doctrine, able to explain the Scriptures well; but if he be ignorant of Literature, let him be meek; let him abound in Love towards every man, lest they should accuse the Bishop in any affair, and he should be at all culpable. (Copt. Coll. book 1. can. 16.)

II. *That the Bishop is to ordain Two, or rather Three, Presbyters.*

IF the Bishop whom they shall appoint hath attended to the Knowledge and Patience of the Love of God with those with him, let him ordain Two Presbyters when he hath examined them, or rather Three.

It behoveth the Presbyters that they should live in the World, after the manner of old Men, removing far off, that they should not touch a woman, being charitable, lovers of the brethren; that they should not accept persons, being partakers of the holy mysteries with the Bishop, assisting in all things, collecting the multitude together, that they may love their Shepherd. And the Presbyters on the Right Hand have the care of those who labour at the Altar, that they should honour those who are worthy of all honour, and rebuke those who merit their rebuke. The Presbyters on the Left Hand shall have the care of the People, that they may be upright, that no one may be disturbed. And they shall instruct them that they should be in all subjection. But when they have instructed one, answering contumaciously, those within the Altar should be of one heart, and one mind, that they may receive the reward of that honour according to its desert. And all the rest shall fear lest they should deviate, and one of them should become changed like one wasting away, and all should be brought into captivity. (Copt. Can. 17, 18.)

III. *How the Reader is to be proved, and what is required of him.*

THE Reader shall be appointed after he hath been fully proved; one who bridleth his tongue, not a drunkard, no a derider in his speech, but decorous in his appearance; obedient, being the first to congregate on the Lord's Day; a Servant knowing what is meet for him, that he may fulfil the Work of publishing the Gospel. For he who filleth the Ears of others with his Doctrines, it becometh him the more that he should be a faithful Workman before God. (Copt. Can. 19.)

IV[a]. *How the Deacon is to be proved, and what is required of him.*

LET the Deacons be appointed by Three testifying to their Life. For it is written: "By the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established." Let them be proved in every Service, all the People bearing witness to them, that they have resided with one wife, have brought up their children well, being humble, prudent, meek, sober, quiet; not vehement, nor murmurers; not double-tongued, nor wrathful, for wrath destroyeth the wise; nor hypocrites. They shall not afflict the Poor, neither shall they accept the persons of the Rich; they shall not be drinkers of much wine, being ready to act in every good service in secret. Cheerful in their habitations, constraining the Brethren who have, that they should open their hand to give. And they also being givers, the goods being in common, that the People may honour them with all honour, and all fear, beseeching with great earnestness those who walk in dissimulation. And some they should teach, and some they should rebuke, but the rest they should prohibit. But let those

who despise, and the contumacious, be cast out, knowing that all Men who are vehement or slanderers fight against Christ. (Copt. Can. 20.)

IV[b]. *Additional Ordinance respecting the Deacons.*

LET the Deacons be doers of good Works, drawing near by day and night in every place. They must not exalt themselves above the Poor, neither must they accept the persons of the Rich. They shall know the Afflicted, that they may give to him out of their store of Provisions; constraining those who are able for good works to gather them in, attending to the words of our Master: "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat." For those who have ministered without Sin, gain for themselves much confidence. (Copt. Can. 22.)

V. *How three Widows are to be appointed, and what are their Duties.*

LET three Widows be appointed; two that they may give their whole attention to prayer for every one who is in temptations, and that they may render thanks to Him whom they follow. But the other one should be left constantly with the women who are tried in sickness, ministering well; watching and telling to the Presbyters the things which take place. Not a lover of filthy lucre; not given to drink: that she may be able to watch, that she may minister in the night. And if another desireth to help to do good works, let her do so according to the pleasure of her heart; for these are the good things which the Lord first commanded. (Copt. Can. 21.)

VI. *For what Purpose Deaconesses are to be appointed.*

CHRIST gave no place for the Women, that they might help at the Altar. Martha said of Mary: "See how she laughs." Mary said: "I laughed not; but he said to us, teaching, that the weak shall be liberated by the strong."

Some say, it becometh the Women to pray standing, and that they should not cast themselves down upon the Earth.

Women are not to be appointed for a Service, besides this Service only, that they assist the Indigent. (Copt. Can. 26—28.)

B.

THE SECOND SET

OF

Ordinances of the Church of Alexandria respecting the Clergy.

(Coptic Collection, second book.)

I. *How a Bishop is to be elected and ordained, and how he is to say the Thanksgiving.*

A BISHOP shall be ordained who hath been chosen by all the People and is blameless. When the name of this one hath been named and they have agreed, all the People shall assemble together, and the Presbyters and Deacons, on the Lord's Day, all the Bishops consenting; and the Presbyters standing quietly, and they all being silent together, they shall pray in their heart that the Holy Spirit may descend upon him. And he who is worthy out of the Bishops, every one standing, putteth his hand upon him whom they have made a Bishop, praying over him. And when he is made a Bishop, let all give the Salutation of Peace to him, saluting him with the mouth. And let the Deacons present the Holy Communion to him. And he, when he hath put his hand upon the Eucharist with the Presbyters, let him say the Thanksgiving: "The Lord be with you all." Let all the People say: "And with thy spirit." He shall say: "Lift up your hearts." The People shall say: "We have them to the Lord." He shall say again: "Let us

give thanks to the Lord." All the People shall say: "(It is) worthy and just." And let him pray thus, saying the (Prayers) following these, according to the custom of the Holy Communion. (Copt. Coll. book II. can. 31.)

I*. *The same according to the Ethiopic Collection.*

THE Bishop shall be chosen by all the People. He must be without blame, as it is written in the Apostle (Epistle to Timothy). In the week in which he is to be ordained, if all the People say of him, "We choose him," he is not to be molested. And they shall pray over him, and say: "O God, show Thy love to this man whom Thou hast prepared for us." And they shall choose one of the Bishops and one of the Presbyters; and they shall lay their hands upon his head and pray. (Ethiopic Coll. can. 2.)

II*. *How a Presbyter is to be ordained, according to that same Ethiopic Collection.*

WHEN a Presbyter is to be ordained, there shall be done to him in every respect as is done to a Bishop, except placing him on the Cathedra, and they shall pray over him all the Prayers of the Bishop, except the name of the Bishop only; and the Presbyter shall equal the Bishop in every thing except the name of the Cathedra and of Ordination. For he hath not given to him the power of Ordination. (The same, can. 4.)

II. *The same, according to the Coptic Collection.*

AND when the Bishop shall ordain a Presbyter, he shall put his hands upon his head, and all the Presbyters shall touch him. And let him pray over him, according to the form which we have spoken of concerning the Bishops. (Copt. Can. 32.)

III. *How a Deacon is to be appointed, and what is his Office.*

AND the Bishop shall appoint a Deacon who hath been chosen: the Bishop alone shall lay his hands on him: because he shall not be ordained for the Priesthood but for the service of the Bishop, that he may do those things which he shall command him. Neither shall he be appointed, that he may be of the Council of all the Clergy, but that he may take care of the Sick, and he shall make them known to the Bishop. Neither shall he be appointed that he may receive the Spirit of Greatness which the Presbyter shall receive, but that he may be worthy that the Bishop may believe him in those things which it behoveth him. On this account the Bishop alone shall ordain the Deacon. (Copt. Can. 33[a].)

IV. *In what a Bishop differs from an Elder.*

BUT the Bishop shall ordain the Presbyter. He shall lay the hand on him, because that same Spirit cometh upon him: for the Presbyter receiveth it only, he hath not power to give it to the Clergy; therefore he will not be able to appoint the Clergy. The Presbyter is only sealing (is only able to baptize and give the Spirit to the Baptized in anointing him), the Bishop shall ordain him. (Copt. Can. 33[b].)

1871489

V. *That a Confessor needeth no Ordination to become Deacon or Presbyter.*

BUT if the Confessor hath been in Bonds for the name of the Lord, they shall not lay hands on him for the service (of Deacons), or for the office of Presbyter, for he hath the honour of Eldership by his Confession. But if they will appoint him for a Bishop, they shall lay hands on him. But if he is a Confessor, he shall not have been taken in before the Authorities; neither shall he have been punished with Bonds; neither shall he have been cast into Prison; neither shall he have been condemned in any Injustice. But according to the Word, because he hath been reviled alone for the name of our Lord, and hath been punished with Punishment in a House, and hath confessed, he is worthy of every Sacerdotal Office from them, they shall lay hands on him, and every one shall pray according to his ability. But if he is able to pray suitably, and the Prayer acceptable, it is good. But if, when he again prayeth, he sendeth forth a Prayer in (a certain) measure, no one forbidding him, let him only pray entirely in a right Faith. (Copt. Can. 34.)

VI. *How a Reader is to be appointed.*

THE Reader shall be appointed. The Bishop shall give him the Book of the Apostles, and shall pray over him, but he shall not lay his hand upon him. (Copt. Can. 35.)

VII. *How Widows are to be appointed.*

BUT when a Widow is appointed, she shall not be ordained, but she shall be chosen by Name; and if her Husband hath been dead for a long time, let her be appointed. But if she hath not delayed from the Death of her Husband, believe her not. But if she hath become old, let her be proved for a time; for often even the Passion long surviveth, and will have place in them.

Let a Widow be appointed by Word only. She shall be united with the rest. They shall not lay hands on her, because she shall not put on the Eucharist, neither shall she perform Public Service. But Imposition of Hands shall be with the Clergy for the Ministry. But the Widow is appointed for Prayer, and that is of all. (Copt. Can. 37.)

VIII. *How Virgins are to be appointed.*

THERE shall be no Imposition of Hands on a Virgin; for it is her Choice alone that maketh her a Virgin. (Copt. Can. 38.)

IX. *What is to be done with him who hath the Gifts of Healing.*

IF one shall say, "I have received the Gifts of Healing by a revelation," they shall not lay hands on him; for the thing itself will be manifest if he speak truth. (Copt. Can. 39.)

C.

THE THIRD SET

OF

Ordinances of the Church of Alexandria respecting the Clergy.

(Coptic Collection, fourth book.)

I. *How a Bishop is to be elected, proved, and ordained.*

IT is necessary that a Bishop should be ordained; first being chosen, being a holy Person, approved in all things, chosen by all the People; and when he hath been named and approved, let all the People, and the Presbyters, and the honoured Bishops assemble together on the Lord's Day, and let the principal among them ask the Presbyters and all the People: "Is this the Man whom ye desire for a Ruler?" And if they shall say, "Yes, this is he in truth," let him ask them again: "Do ye all bear witness to him, that he is worthy of this great, honourable, and holy Authority? and whether he hath been pure in the piety which he hath towards God? And whether he observeth justice towards all men? And whether he governeth his own house well? And whether his whole life hath been blameless, and he hath not been apprehended in any thing, neither those of his house?"

And if they all together have witnessed that he is such an one according to the truth, and not according to favour, God the Father, and his only-begotten son Jesus Christ our Lord, and the Holy Spirit being judge that these things are so; let them be asked the third time, if he be worthy of this

great Service, of this Sacrifice, "That out of the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established:" and if they shall say the third time that he is worthy, let their Votes be received from them all; and when they have given these cheerfully, let them be silent and quiet. And one of the principal Bishops shall take with him two other Bishops, all the Bishops standing near the Altar, praying in silence with the Presbyters; all the Deacons also holding the holy Gospels spread open upon the head of him who is to be ordained, the Bishop praying to God over him. And when he hath finished praying over him, let one of the Bishops place the Oblation upon the hands of him who is ordained, and let the Bishops place him upon the Throne which becometh him. (Copt. Can. 65.)

II. *How the Bishop is to ordain a Presbyter or Deacon.*

WHEN thou, O Bishop, ordainest a *Presbyter*, lay thy hand upon his head, all the Presbyters standing, and the Deacons praying, ordaining him. Thou shalt also ordain the Deacon according to this first Ordination. (Copt. Can. 67[a].)

III. *How he is to appoint Subdeacons, and Readers, and Deaconesses.*

AND concerning the Subdeacons, and Readers, and Deaconesses, it is not necessary to ordain them. (Can. 67[b].)

IV. *That a Confessor needeth no Ordination, unless made a Bishop.*

ORDAIN not the *Confessor*, for this thing is of his Choice and Patience; for he is worthy of a great honour, as he who hath confessed the name of God and his Son, before Kings and Nations. But if there shall be occasion that he should be made a Bishop, or a Presbyter, or a Deacon, let him be ordained. (Can. 68[a].)

V. *Against arrogant and presumptuous Confessors.*

IF a Confessor who hath not been ordained hath seized for himself the Dignity, on account of the Confession, let him be anathematized; for he is not one since he hath denied the Command of Christ, and "hath become worse than an Infidel." (Can. 68[b].)

VI. *Virgins not to be ordained.*

LET not a *Virgin* be ordained, for we have no Command from the Lord. For this struggle is her choice, and is not for the reproach of Marriage, but for the leisure of serving God. (Can. 69.)

VII. *Precautions in the Appointment of Widows.*

A *WIDOW* shall not be ordained; but if it is a great distance of time since her Husband died, and she has lived prudently, and they have not found any fault against her, and she

has taken care of those of her house well, as Judith and Anna, women of purity, let her be appointed to the order of Widows. But if she hath not waited from the Death of her Husband believe her not, but let her be proved by the time. For the evil Passion remaineth in old Persons, with those who will permit it a place in themselves, if it be not restrained with a sharp Bridle. (Can. 70.)

VIII. *Precautions as to Persons who have the Gift of Healing the Possessed.*

EXORCISTS shall not be ordained, for the design is of the choice of the will, and of the grace of God, and Christ Jesus. When the Holy Spirit is manifested in the man he will receive the Gift of Healing; it is made manifest by the revelation of God, by the grace of God which is in him, giving light to all men. But if there be a necessity that he should be a Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, let him be ordained. (Can. 71.)

IX. *Additional Ordinance as to the case of a Bishop having been ordained by one Bishop only.*

IT is necessary that a Bishop should be ordained by three, or two, Bishops; but if one Bishop hath ordained him let him be anathematized. But if a necessity hath happened to any one that he should be ordained by one only, because they are not able to gather together on account of the Persecution which is without, or on account of any other such like cause, let the Permission from many other holy Bishops be received for doing this, which is requisite for him. (Can. 72.)

X. *General Definitions of the peculiar Right and Power of the different Members of the Clergy.*

THE Bishop blesseth, but is not blessed. He ordaineth, layeth on hands upon men, putteth on the Oblation, receiveth the Blessing from the Bishops, but not from the Presbyters. The Bishop anathematizeth (excludeth) every Clergyman who deserveth to be anathematized (excluded); but to another Bishop he is without power to do this alone.

A Presbyter also blesseth and receiveth the Blessing from his fellow-Presbyter and from the Bishop; and he likewise giveth it to his fellow-Presbyter. He layeth his hands on men, but he doth not ordain, neither doth he anathematize. He putteth out those who are under him; and if there are any deserving of Punishment, let him give it them.

A Deacon doth not bless, neither doth he give the Blessing, but he receiveth it from the Bishop and the Presbyter. He doth not baptize, neither doth he put on the Eucharist. But when the Bishop and the Presbyter have set on the Eucharist, the Deacon giveth the Cup, not as a Priest, but as one who ministereth to the Priests. There is no power in any other of the Clergy to do the work of a Deacon.

And a Deaconess doth not bless, neither doth she do any of those things which the Presbyters and the Deacons do, but she keepeth the Doors only, and ministereth to the Presbyters at the time of the Baptism of Women, because this is becoming.

A Deacon can put out the Subdeacon, and the Readers, and the Singer, and the Deaconesses, if occasion leads him, no Presbyter indeed being there. A Subdeacon has no power to put out a Reader, or a Singer, or a Deaconess, or a Lay Person, for he is a Minister to the Deacons. (Can. 73.)

APPENDIX.

A.

The Requisites and Duties of a Bishop, according to the Third Book of the Greek Apostolical Constitutions.

A PASTOR who is to be ordained a Bishop in any Parish must be unblamable, unreprovable, free from all kinds of wickedness common among men, not under fifty years of age. . . . But if in a small Parish one advanced in years is not to be found, let some younger Person who hath a good report among his Neighbours, and is esteemed by them worthy of the office of a Bishop, . . . after Examination and a general good Report be ordained in peace . . .

Let not a Bishop be given to filthy lucre, especially before the Gentiles, rather suffering than offering injuries, not covetous nor rapacious, no purloiner, no admirer nor hater of the poor, no evil-speaker nor false witness, not given to anger, no brawler, not entangled with the affairs of this life, not a surety for any one, nor an accuser in suits about money, not ambitious, not double-minded nor double-tongued, not ready to hearken to calumny or evil-speaking, not a dissembler, not addicted to the heathen festivals, not given to vain deceits, not eager after worldly things nor a lover of money. For all these things are opposed to God, and pleasing to Demons. . . .

Rebuke, O Bishop, those that sin, admonish those that are not converted, exhort those that stand to persevere in their goodness; receive the Penitent, for the Lord God hath promised with an oath to grant remission to the Penitent for what things they have done amiss. . . . Condemn the guilty Person with authority, afterwards try to bring him home with mercy and compassion and readiness to receive him, promising him salvation, if he will change his course of life . . .

Do not admit less Evidence to convict any one than that of Three Witnesses, and those of known and established reputations.

Let the Bishop use those Tithes and First-fruits which are given according to the command of God, as a man of God; as also, let him dispense in a right manner the free-will Offerings, which are brought in on account of the Poor, the Orphans, the Widows, the Afflicted and Strangers in distress, as having that God for the examiner of his accounts, who hath committed the disposition to him. Distribute to all those in want with Righteousness; and yourselves use the things which belong to the Lord, but do not abuse them; eating of them, but not eating them all up by yourselves; communicate with those that are in want, and thereby show yourselves unblamable before God. (Third Book, ch. 20. extract.)

B.

On the Marriage of the Clergy.

A BISHOP, a Presbyter, and a Deacon, when they are constituted, must be but once married, whether their Wives be alive, or whether they be dead; and it is not lawful for them, if they are unmarried when they are ordained, to be married afterwards; or if they be then married, to marry a second time, but to be content with that Wife which they had when they came to Ordination. We also appoint that the Ministers and Singers and Readers and Porters shall be only once married. But if they entered into the Clergy before they were married, we permit them to marry, if they have an inclination thereto, lest they sin and incur Punishment. But we do not permit any one of the Clergy to take to wife either an Whore or a Servant or a Widow, or one that is divorced, as also the Law says. Let the Deaconess be a pure Virgin, or at least a Widow who hath been but once married, faithful and well esteemed. (vi. 17.)

THIRD BOOK.

The Order and Formularies of the Service:

OR,

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE AND WORSHIP OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

THIS BOOK CONTAINETH:

A. The *Liturgy*, or the General Order of the Service.
First Part: Preparatory Service (Service of the Catechumens).
Second Part: Service of the Believers, or Service of Thanksgiving (Eucharist).

B. Some recorded early *Forms of Thanksgiving.*

I. The Hymn of Thanksgiving, or the Morning Hymn of the early Church.
1. According to the Alexandrian Manuscript of the Bible. Also called Hymnus Angelicus.
2. The same reduced to its primitive Form.

II. The Morning Psalm (Ps. lxiii.), or the Morning Verse between Psalm Verses.

III. The Evening Psalm (Ps. xli.), or the Song of Simeon, or the Christian Psalm composed of Psalm Verses.

IV. The Evening Hymn of the Greek Christians.

V. The Evening Hymn of the Apostolic Constitutions.

APPENDIX.

I. A Form of Prayer of Thanksgiving before the Communion.

II. A Form of Thanksgiving after the Communion.

Book III.

A.

The Liturgy, or the General Order of the Service.

FIRST PART.

Preparatory Service, or Service of the Catechumens.

Accessible also to the Hearers, who are learning the Word, but have not yet taken the Sacred Pledge, and therefore do not belong to the Communion of the Believers.

A Psalm of the Old (or New?) Testament sung in the antiphonic Manner of the Hebrew poetry, according to Hemistichs.

Or also an Act of Humiliation and Confession.

The Doxology, or the Praise, at the end of a Psalm:

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen.

Or,

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen.

Or,

Glory be to the Father in (or *through*) *the Son, and through the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. Amen.*

A Canticle of the Old Testament.

Or a Christian Hymn or Sacred Song.

Lesson from the Old Testament.

Lesson from the New Testament.

Homily, or Explanation of Scripture, especially of the Gospel, and Exhortations to Christian Faith and Life.

Dismissal of the Catechumens or Hearers, with Blessing.

SECOND PART.

The Service of the Believers, or Service of Thanksgiving (Eucharist).

The *Oblation*, or Placing of Bread and Wine (and First-fruits) on the Communion Table.

Generally a Word of *Admonition* premised, as:

No Profane!
Wisdom!

The mutual *Salutation* of Bishop (or Presbyters) and People:

The Lord be with you:
And with thy Spirit.

The *Preface*, or Introduction to the Thanksgiving for the Gifts of God and for Christ's Redemption:

Lift up your Hearts:
We lift them up unto the Lord.
Let us give thanks unto the Lord:
It is meet and right so to do.

The *Prayer of Thanksgiving:* either only

The Lord's Prayer,

to which, for that purpose, the following Doxology or concluding Praise was added, with the usual Response:

For Thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, for ever and ever.

[Or,

For Thine is the Power for ever and ever.]

Amen.

Or, besides, a free Prayer of the Bishop or Elder, praising God's Benefits from the Creation of the World, and asking his Blessing for the Communicants.

(The Words of the Institution formed no necessary part of this Prayer of Consecration, but may have been historically recited.)

The Communion of all the Believers present, taken both in the Bread and in the Cup.

Antiphonic Verses used before the Communion, according to the Custom of the Church.

The *Cherubic Hymn*, or *Trisagion*, from Isaiah:

Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord the God of Sabaoth.

Heaven and Earth are full of Thy Glory.

After this Verse, or perhaps originally instead of it, was sung:

The *Hymn of Thanksgiving*, or the *Morning Hymn.*

(See the text at the head of the Hymns.)

Other Antiphonic Verses used before the Communion:

Hosanna to the Son of David:

Blessed be he who cometh in the Name of the Lord.

Or,

God is the Lord:

Who was made manifest to us in the Flesh.

Or, Exhortations and Admonitions to the Congregation:

He who is holy, let him draw near:

If he is not, let him become so through Penitence.

Or,

This is Maranatha! (the Lord cometh!)

After the Communion.

Prayer of Thanksgiving, for the Benefit and Grace received (sometimes the Lord's Prayer with Doxology used at this place).

The Dismissal of the Congregation with the Blessing.

B.

The recorded early Hymns and Forms of Thanksgiving.

I. *The Hymn of Thanksgiving, or the Morning Hymn of the early Church.*

1. *According to the Alexandrian Manuscript of the Bible: also called Hymnus Angelicus.*

GLORY be to God on high, and on Earth Peace, good Will among Men. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee: we give thanks to Thee for Thy great Glory; O Lord, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty! O Lord, the only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; and the Holy Ghost, O Lord God! O Lamb of God! Son of the Father, that takest away the Sins of the World, have Mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the Sins of the World, have Mercy upon us, receive our Prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have Mercy upon us. For Thou only art holy: Thou only the Lord, Jesus Christ, to the Glory of God the Father. *Amen.*

2. *The same reduced to its primitive Form.*

GLORY be to God on high:
And on Earth Peace, good Will among Men.
[Or, perhaps more primitively:
And on Earth Peace among the Men of good Will.]

We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee,
We give Thanks to Thee for Thy great Glory.
O Lord heavenly King, God the Father Almighty:
Lord God!

O Lord, the only-begotten Son:
Jesus Christ!
That takest away the Sins of the World:
Have Mercy upon us.
Thou that takest away the Sins of the World:
Have Mercy upon us, receive our Prayer.
Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father:
Have Mercy upon us.

For thou only art Holy:
Thou only art the Lord, Jesus Christ:
To the Glory of God the Father. *Amen.*

II. *The Morning Psalm* (Ps. lxiii.), *or the following Morning Verse between Psalm Verses:*

EVERY day will I bless Thee:
And I will bless Thy Name for ever and ever.
Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this Day without Sin.
Blessed art Thou, O Lord God of our Fathers:
And thy Name be praised and glorified for ever and ever.
Amen.

III. *The Evening Psalm* (Ps. xli.), *or the Song of Simeon, or the following Psalm composed of Psalm Verses:*

BLESSED art thou, O Lord, teach me Thy Statutes.
Lord, Thou hast been our Dwelling-place in all Generations.
I said, Lord, be merciful unto me:
Heal my Soul, for I have sinned against Thee.
Lord, I flee unto Thee to hide me.

Teach me to do Thy Will:
For thou art my God.
For with Thee is the Fountain of Life:
In Thy Light shall we see Light.
O continue thy Loving-kindness unto them that know Thee.

IV. *The Evening Hymn of the Greek Christians.*

SERENE Light of holy Glory,
Of the Father everlasting, Jesus Christ!
Having come to the Setting of the Sun,
And seeing the Evening Light,
We praise the Father and the Son
And the Holy Spirit of God.
It behoveth to praise Thee
At all Times with holy Songs,
Son of God who hast given Life,
Therefore the World glorifieth Thee.

V. *The Evening Hymn of the Apostolic Constitutions.*

PRAISE, O ye Servants, the Lord:
Praise the Name of the Lord.
We praise Thee, we sing unto Thee, we bless Thee:
On account of Thy great Glory.
O Lord the King, Father of Christ:
Of the spotless Lamb, which taketh away the Sins of the World.
It behoveth to praise Thee:
It behoveth to sing unto Thee.
It behoveth to glorify Thee, God and Father:
Through the Son, in the Holy Ghost, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

APPENDIX

FROM

THE SEVENTH BOOK OF THE GREEK CONSTITUTIONS.

Liturgical Formularies.

I. *A Form of Prayer of Thanksgiving before the Communion.*

WE thank Thee, our Father, for that Life which Thou hast made known to us by Jesus thy Son, by whom Thou madest all things, and takest care of the whole World; whom Thou hast sent to become Man for our Salvation; whom Thou hast permitted to suffer and to die; whom Thou hast raised up, and been pleased to glorify, and hast set down on Thy right hand: by whom Thou hast promised us the Resurrection of the Dead. Do Thou, O Lord Almighty, Everlasting God, so gather together Thy Church from the ends of the Earth into Thy Kingdom, as this (Corn) was once scattered, and is now become one Loaf. We also, our Father, thank Thee for the precious Blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed for us, and for His precious Body, whereof we celebrate this Representation, as Himself appointed us, to shew forth his Death. For, through Him, Glory is to be given to Thee for ever. *Amen.*

II. *A Form of Thanksgiving after the Communion.*

WE thank Thee, O God and Father of Jesus our Saviour, for Thy Holy Name, which Thou hast made to inhabit among us; and that Knowledge, Faith, Love, and Immortality, which Thou hast given us through Thy Son Jesus. Thou, O Almighty Lord, the God of the Universe, hast created the World, and the things that

are therein by Him; and hast planted a Law in our Souls, and beforehand didst prepare things for the convenience of Men. O God of our holy and blameless Fathers, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, Thy faithful Servants; Thou, O God, who art powerful, faithful, and true, and without Deceit in Thy Promises; who didst send upon Earth Jesus Thy Christ to converse with Men, as a Man, when he was God, the Word, and Man, to take away error by the roots; do Thou, even now, through Him, be mindful of this Thy Holy Church, which Thou hast purchased with the precious Blood of Thy Christ, and deliver it from all Evil, and perfect it in Thy Love and Thy Truth, and gather us all together into Thy Kingdom which Thou hast prepared. *Amen.*

FOURTH BOOK.

Rules of General Conduct

FOR

ALL MEMBERS OF THE CONGREGATION:

OR,

THE CONGREGATIONAL, SOCIAL, AND DOMESTIC LIFE OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.

THIS BOOK CONTAINETH:

First Chapter: *Regulation of Christian Life respecting the Worship and Service.* — From the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions.

I. That the Christians are to fast in the Holy Week, but keep the other Sabbaths as Festivals.
II. On the Celebration of the Lord's Day.
III. That the Believers alone are to partake of the Eucharist.
IV. How far Presbyters coming from other Churches are to be allowed to say the Thanksgiving.

Second Chapter: *Rules of Christian Conduct in the Love-Feasts and other social Meetings, and in domestic Life.*

I. That the Bishop is always to be ready to take Bread and Wine in the Church with any one of the Faithful who wishes it.
II. How the Christians are to behave in their Love-Feasts.
III. How one of the Widows may take part in a Love-Feast.

IV. How the Christian is to begin his Day-work by Prayer, and by hearing the Word of God, and take the Communion, if there is a Place of Christian Meeting.
V. The same Ordinance amplified.
VI. That every Believer is to take the Communion at the Dawn of Day, and how.
VII. How the Christian is to edify himself in his own House.
VIII. At what hours and with what Meditations the Christian is to pray, Morning, Forenoon, Noon, Afternoon, Evening, and Middle of the Night.
IX. What is the Meaning of the Christian signing himself with the Sign of the Cross.
X. Injunction on the Praying of the Lord's Prayer. (From the Greek Constitutions.)
XI. On private and public Devotion. (From the Fifth Book of the Coptic Canons.)
XII. On what Days Christians are to celebrate the Commemoration of the Dead.
XIII. How Presbyters and Deacons are to behave at the Funeral Meals.
XIV. How Cemeteries and Burials are to be arranged.
XV. That Christians ought to abstain from eating sacrificial Meat.
XVI. How many Days the Servants are to work.

APPENDIX.

On Conjugal Life and on Impurities.

Book IV.

FIRST CHAPTER.

REGULATION OF CHRISTIAN LIFE RESPECTING THE WORSHIP AND SERVICE.

(From the Seventh Book of the Greek Constitutions.)

I. *That the Christians are to fast in the Holy Week, but keep the Sabbath as a Festival, except Easter-Eve.*

LET not your Fasts be with the Hypocrites; for they fast on the second and fifth days of the (Holy) week. But do you either fast the entire Five Days (Monday to Friday in the Holy Week), or on the Fourth Day of the Week, and on the Day of the Preparation (Wednesday and Friday of the Holy Week). Because on the fourth day the Condemnation went out against the Lord, Judas then promising to betray him for money; and you must fast on the Day of the Preparation, because on that day the Lord suffered the death of the Cross, under Pontius Pilate. But keep the Sabbath and the Lord's Day Festival; because the former is the memorial of the Creation, and the latter of the Resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord's Burial, on which men ought to keep a Fast, but not a Festival. For inasmuch as the Creator was

then under the earth, the sorrow for him is more forcible than the joy for the Creation: for the Creator is more honourable by nature and dignity than his own Creatures. (VII. 23.)

II. *On the Celebration of the Lord's Day.*

ON the Day of the Resurrection of the Lord, that is the Lord's Day, assemble yourselves together, without fail, giving thanks to God and praising him for those mercies He has bestowed upon you, through Christ; and for that He has delivered you from ignorance, error, and bondage; that your Sacrifice may be unspotted, and acceptable to God, who has said concerning his Universal Church: "*In every place shall Incense and a pure Sacrifice be offered unto me; for I am a great King, saith the Lord Almighty, and my name is wonderful among the Heathen.*" (VII. 30.)

III. *That the Faithful alone are to partake of the Eucharist.*

LET no one eat of these things that is not initiated; but those only who have been baptized into the death of the Lord. But if any one that is not initiated conceal himself and partake of the same, "*He eateth eternal Damnation;*" because being not of the faith of Christ he has partaken of such things as it is not lawful for him to partake of, to his own punishment. But if any one is a Partaker through Ignorance, instruct him quickly, and initiate him, that he may not go out and despise you. (VII. 25.)

IV. *How far Presbyters coming from other Churches are to be allowed to say the Thanksgiving.*

WHOSOEVER being a Presbyter cometh to you and giveth thanks in a Christian manner, receive him as a Disciple of Christ. But if he preach another Doctrine, different from that which Christ has delivered to you, such an one you must not permit to give thanks; for such an one rather affronteth God than glorifieth him. But whosoever cometh to you, let him be first examined, and then received, for ye have Understanding, and are able to know the right hand from the left, and to distinguish false Teachers from true Teachers. But when a Teacher cometh to you, supply him with what he wanteth in all readiness. And even when a false Teacher cometh, you shall give him for his necessity, but shall not receive his error. Nor indeed may ye pray together with him, lest ye be polluted as well as he. Every true Prophet or Teacher that cometh to you is *worthy of his maintenance*, as being a *Labourer* in the Word of Righteousness. (VII. 28.)

SECOND CHAPTER.

RULES OF CHRISTIAN CONDUCT IN THE LOVE-FEASTS AND OTHER SOCIAL MEETINGS, AND IN DOMESTIC LIFE.

I. *That the Bishop is always to be ready to take Bread and Wine in the Church with any one Believer who wisheth it.*

LET Widows and Virgins fast often, and let them pray in the Church; likewise the Presbyters and the Laity, let them fast when they will. But the Bishop is not able to fast except on the day that all the People fast. For it may be that some one may wish to take something in the Church, and it is not possible for him to deny. And if he break the Bread at all, he will taste the Bread, and eat it, and the rest of the Believers with him. Let them receive from the hand of the Bishop a portion of the same Bread, before each one shall divide the Bread which is for him; for this is a Blessing and is not a Thanksgiving, like the body of the Lord. (Copt. Coll. book II. can. 47.)

II. *How Christians are to behave in their Love-Feasts.*

IT becometh every one before he drink to take the Cup and give thanks over it, that he may drink and eat with purity. And thus let them give to the Catechumens of the Bread of Exorcism, and a Cup. (Can. 48.)

And let those who eat remember him who has called them, as often as they eat. For on this account he constrained them, that they should come in under his roof. (Can. 49.)

And when ye eat and drink in tranquillity, drink not that ye may be drunken, that men may deride you, and he who has called you is sorrowful for your Dissoluteness. But that he shall pray the Saints (Believers) to go in to him; for he has said, "Ye are the Salt of the Earth."

If they have given to you all the Portions together, thou shalt come bearing thy Part alone. And when you have been called to eat, you shall eat only what sufficeth you, for as to what remaineth, he who has called you shall do with it what he pleaseth, so that it remaineth for the Believers, and he will rejoice in your entering in to him.

And those who have been called shall surely eat, but let them eat in peace, and not contentiously. And if the Bishop should command any one to seek for a word, let him answer him. And if the Bishop has spoken, let every one be silent with attention, until he interrogateth him again. And if a Bishop be not there, but the Believers alone are at the Supper, let them receive the Blessing from the Presbyter, if he be there, but if he be not there, let them receive it from a Deacon. Likewise that the Catechumen receive the Bread of Exorcism. The Laity being by themselves without a Clergyman, let them eat with moderation, but the Layman cannot give the Blessing. (Can. 50.)

And let each one eat with Thanksgiving, in the name of God, for this is proper for the Servant of God, that we all should be watchful, and the Gentiles will emulate us. (Can. 51.)

III. *How one of the Widows may take part in a Love-Feast.*

IF any one desireth for a time to call the Widows, let him feed every one who is become old, and send them away before the Evening cometh. And if it be not possible for the Clergy-

man to whom they have ministered to come, let him give them Wine and something to eat, and they shall eat in their own House, as they will. (Can. 52.)

IV. *How the Christian is to begin his Day-work by Prayer and by hearing the Word of God and taking the Communion, if there is a Place of Christian Meeting.*

LET all Believers when they shall wake up, before they put their hand to any Work, pray to the Lord, and thus let them approach their Work.

And when there shall be a Word of Instruction let them prefer it greatly to go to hear the Word of God for the edification of their Souls. And let them hasten that they may go into the Church, the place in which the Spirit quickeneth. (Coptic Coll. book II. can. 57.)

V. *The same Ordinance amplified.*

AND all Believers, men and women, when they have risen in the morning from sleep, before they touch any Work, let them wash their hands, and they shall pray to God, and thus let them proceed to their Work.

And when it cometh to pass that there shall be an Exhortation of the Word of God, let every one choose for himself to go to that place, reckoning this in his heart, that he has heard God speaking in the Exhortation, for praying in the Church will prevail. For when the Darkness of the day is passed by, let the timid reckon that it is a great Sin if he go not to the place in which they exhort; and especially he who is able to read. Or when the Teacher cometh, let not any one of you be

last in the Church, the place in which they instruct. Then it shall be given to him who speaketh that he shall declare things useful to every one, and thou shalt hear the things thou thinkest not, and thou shalt profit by those things which the Holy Spirit shall give to thee by the Exhortation; and thus thy Faith shall be established by those things which thou hast heard. And they shall speak to thee again in that place of those things which it becometh thee to do in thy house. Therefore let every one hasten to go into the Church, the place where the Holy Spirit stirs up. (Can. 62ª.)

VI. *That every faithful Person is to take the Communion at the Dawn of Day, and how.*

AND let every Believer hasten to partake of the Eucharist before he tasteth of any other thing.

Let every one take care by investigation that no Unbeliever eateth of the Eucharist; nor a mouse, nor other creature; or that any other thing indeed has fallen into it which has strayed. This is the Body of Christ which all Believers partake of, and it is not becoming to despise it.

For if thou hast blessed the Cup in the name of God, and hast partaken of it, like as of the Blood of Christ, keep thyself with the greatest care: spill not of it, lest a strange Spirit should lick it up, that God may not be angry with thee as one who has despised it, and thou shalt be guilty of the Blood of Christ by thy contempt of the price by which thou wast purchased.

Let the Deacons and the Presbyters assemble daily in the place in which the Bishops shall command them; and the Deacons shall not be negligent in assembling to see to all things, unless Sickness hinder them. When they have collected all, let them make the distribution to those in the Church.

And thus when they have prayed let each one proceed to the employment appointed him. (Coptic Collection, book II. can. 57—60.)

VII. *How the Christian is to edify himself in his own House.*

WHEN there is a day in which there is no Exhortation, let every one being in his House take a holy Book, reading in it sufficiently what appeareth to him useful. (Can. 62[b].)

VIII. *At what Hours and with what Meditations the Christian is to pray, Morning, Forenoon, Noon, Afternoon, Evening, and Middle of the Night.*

AND if thou art in thy House, pray at the Third Hour, blessing God. But if thou art in another place having opportunity at that time, pray in thy heart to God; for in that hour they saw Christ nailed to the Wood. Therefore, also, in the old Law it is commanded that they should put on the Shewbread continually, the Type of the Body and Blood of Christ. He also is the Bread which came down from Heaven.

Pray again likewise at the Sixth Hour; for when they crucified Christ on the Wood of the Cross that Day was divided, and there was great Darkness. Wherefore let them pray at that time with a fervent Prayer, availing themselves of the voice of Him who prayed (at that hour) causing all Creation to be dark, by reason of the unbelief of the Jews.

Let them pray again a great Prayer and a great Praise at the Ninth Hour; for thou shalt be enlightened like the Souls of the righteous who blessed the Lord God of truth. He who remembered the Saints, sent to them his Son, who is his Word,

who enlightened them. For in that hour the Side of Christ was pierced with a Spear, and Blood and Water came out; and afterwards it was light the remaining part of the Day until the evening. Therefore thou also, if thou hast gone to thy rest, thou art to remember another Day, and realize the type of the Resurrection.

Pray again before thou restest thyself upon the Bed of thy repose.

And if thou hast risen at Midnight upon thy Bed, wash thy hands and pray; but thou shalt wash thy hands in pure water. And if thou hast a Wife pray together with one another. But if she has not yet believed, thou shalt withdraw thyself into a place and shalt pray alone, and return again to thy place. But thou who art bound in Marriage refrain not from Prayer, for thou art not defiled. For those who are washed, have no need to wash again, for they are purified and are clean. And if thou breathest in thy hand, sealing thyself with the Vapour which shall come out of thy Mouth, thou shalt be all clean, to thy foot, for this is the Gift of the Holy Spirit. And the Drops of Water are the baptismal Drops coming up from the fountain, that is, the heart of the Believer, purifying him who believeth.

There is a necessity again that Prayers should be made at that hour: for the Elders, they who delivered this work to us, likewise taught us thus to purify ourselves; for in that hour all Creation is silent, praising God. The stars and the trees and the waters are as all the host of Angels who stand around, serving with the Souls of the Just, praising God Almighty at that time. Therefore it becometh Believers to pray at that hour. The Lord again has spoken after this manner, witnessing to this, saying: "*In the middle of the night behold there was a cry, Behold the bridegroom cometh, come ye out to meet him.*" And he interpreted the Word again, saying: "*Watch, therefore, because ye know not the day neither the hour when the Son of Man cometh.*" Likewise if thou shalt rise at the time of the Cock-crowing, pray, because the Children of Israel denied Christ at that hour. This we have known who believe on him

by Faith, looking for the hope of the Day of Light for ever, which shall enlighten us for ever in the Resurrection of the Dead.

And all ye Believers, if ye fulfil these things, and remember that ye teach one another, and instruct the Catechumens to perform them, nothing shall try you, and ye shall not mourn for ever. (Can. 62[c].)

IX. *What is the Meaning of the Christian signing himself with the Sign of the Cross.*

REMEMBER Christ continually, and receive this name at all times, sealing thy Forehead in fear, for this is the Sign which is known and manifest, and by this the Devil is ruined. If thou hast done it in Faith thou art not only known before men, but thou hast the knowledge that it is a Sign. For the Adversary the Devil looks to the power of the heart only; and if he seeth the inner Man that is rational, sealed within and without with the Seal of the Word of God, he fleeth immediately, fleeing from him through the Holy Spirit which is in the Man, who has granted him a place in himself. This also Moses the Prophet first taught us by the Passover. For he commanded that they should sprinkle the Blood of the Lamb which had been killed, upon the Lintel and the two Door-posts, showing to us the Faith which is now in us, which was given to us by the perfect Lamb. If we have sealed ourselves with this on our Foreheads, with our hands, we shall be delivered from those who wish to destroy us.

And if ye receive these things with Thanksgiving and a right Faith, ye shall be sanctified, and received into eternal Life. (Can. 62[d].)

X. *Injunction on the Praying of the Lord's Prayer.*—From the Greek Constitutions.

WHEN ye pray, be not ye as the Hypocrites, but as the Lord has appointed us in the Gospel, so pray ye: *Our Father which art in heaven; hallowed be thy Name; thy Kingdom come; thy Will be done as in heaven, so on earth; give us this Day our daily Bread; and forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors; and lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from Evil; for thine is the Kingdom for ever. Amen.* Pray thus thrice in a day, preparing yourselves beforehand, that ye may be worthy of the adoption of the Father; lest when ye call him Father unworthily, ye be reproached by him, as Israel his first-born Son was once told: *If I be a Father, where is my Glory? and if I be a Lord, where is my Fear?* For the Glory of Fathers is the Holiness of their Children; and the Honour of Masters is the Fear of their Servants, as the contrary is dishonour and confusion: for, saith he, *Through you my name is blasphemed among the Gentiles.* (VII. 24.)

XI. *On Private and Public Devotion.*—From the Fifth Book of the Coptic Canons.

WHEN you rise in the Morning, pray. Pray again at the Third Hour, and the Sixth, and the Ninth, and in the Evening, and at the time of Cock-crowing. And at the time of the Light appearing, because the Lord has enlightened us: he has caused the night to pass by, and has brought to us also the light of day. And at the Third Hour, because Pilate gave sentence on the Lord at that hour. And at the Sixth, because they crucified Christ at that hour, and when they pierced his side Blood and Water came out. And again at the Ninth, because when they crucified the Lord, all the earth trembled and

was troubled at the audacity of the ungodly Jews; for nature could not bear seeing its Lord mocked. And in the Evening, you shall give thanks, because he has given you the night for rest from the labours of the day. And at the time of Cock-crowing you shall pray, because it announceth to you in that hour the approach of day, that you may proceed to the works of the light to perform them.

If it be not possible to go into the Church on account of the Unbelievers, thou, O Bishop, shalt make the Assembly in thy House, that the Servants of God may not assemble together with the Ungodly. For it is not the place that sanctifieth the man, but the man that sanctifieth the place. If the Ungodly take possession of the place, flee from it, because they have polluted it. For as holy men sanctify a place, thus again it is that they who are not holy pollute it.

If it has been impossible to assemble together either in the House or in the Church, let every one sing by himself; let him read, let him pray; or the Congregation not being there, two or three together. For he saith: "*Where two or three are gathered together in my name, I am with them in their midst.*"

Let not a Believer pray in the houses of the Catechumens, for it is not just that he who partaketh of the Mystery should touch those who partake not. Neither let him who serveth God pray in the house with an Heretic: "*For what fellowship has Light with Darkness, or what part has Christ with Satan?*"

If a believing Man or Woman have dwelt with a Slave, let them separate, or let them be cast out of the Church. (75c.)

XII. *On what Days Christians are to celebrate the Commemoration of the Dead.*

LET them keep the Third Day for those who have gone to sleep, with Psalms and Prayers, on account of him who arose from the Dead after three days.

And let them celebrate their Seventh Day making remembrance of the living, and those who have slept.

And let them again celebrate their Month from the pattern of the Ancients; for thus did the People mourn for Moses.

And let them observe the Completion of their Year for a Sign of their Remembrance, giving to the Poor out of the Goods of him who has died, making a remembrance of him.

And we say these things concerning the Servants of God only. But concerning the Ungodly, if thou givest every thing which is in the world for them to the Poor, thou wilt profit them nothing. For those to whom God has been an Enemy in this world, he will not cease being an Enemy to after they have departed out of this world, for there is no Injustice in him: "*The righteous Lord has loved righteousness.*" And again, "*Behold the man and his work.*" (Can. 76[a].)

XIII. *How Presbyters and Deacons are to behave at the Funeral Meals.*

BUT if they call you in those days; eat with order and the fear of God, as those who are able to intercede for those who have departed out of this world; for ye are Presbyters and Deacons of Christ. You ought therefore to be sober continually, among yourselves alone, and with others, that you may be able to "warn the unruly;" for the Scripture saith, "*The great are wrathful: let them not drink wine, lest when they drink they should forget wisdom, and be unable to judge with equity.*" And therefore after God Almighty and his beloved Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, are not the Bishops and the Presbyters the chief persons in the Church?

But we say these things, not forbidding them that they should not drink at all, for it is not possible that we can despise what God has made for the Cheerfulness of Men; but we command

that they should not drink to excess. For the Scripture saith not, "Drink not wine at all;" but what doth it say? it saith: "*Drink not wine to excess:*" and again, "*Thorns spring up in the hands of the Drunkard.*" And we say not this of the Clergy alone, but of the Lay Christians also, upon whom the name of Christ Jesus our Lord hath been called. For these are the things which have been said concerning them: "*Who has woe? and who has trouble? and who has judgments? and who has evil communications? and who has beatings without cause? or who has his eyes marked? Do not those who tarry long at the wine, and who seek where are the wine taverns?*" (Copt. Can. book v. can. 76[b].)

XIV. *How Cemeteries and Burials are to be arranged.*

LET them not burthen a man to bury men in the Cemeteries, for it is the work of all the Poor. But let them give Wages to the Workman who diggeth, and a Gift to the Keepers, and to those in that place who have had the care of it. Let the Bishop support them, that no one may press upon them among those who go to those places. (Book II. can. 61.)

XV. *That Christians ought to abstain from eating sacrificial Meat.*

BUT do ye abstain from things offered to Idols; for they offer them in honour of Demons, that is, to the dishonour of the One God, that ye may not become partners with Demons. (Greek Const. book VII. ch. 21.)

XVI. *How many Days the Servants are to work.*

LET the Servants work Five Days, but the Sabbath and the Lord's Day let them have leisure for the Church, that they may be taught Piety in the service of God. On the Sabbath the Lord rested from all the work of Creation which he had finished: the Lord's Day is (a day of rest) on account of the Resurrection of the Lord.

And let them not work in the Week of the great Passover, and that which follows it, which is the Feast: the one in which they crucified the Lord, and the other in which he rose from the Dead. For it is necessary that they should know by the Teaching who died and rose again. (Can. 75[b].)

THE

Law-Book of the Ante-Nicene Church.

THIS BOOK CONTAINETH

The Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles.

APPENDIX.

On Conjugal Life and on Impurities.

A HUSBAND, therefore, and a Wife, when they live together in lawful Marriage, and rise from one another, may pray without observing any rite; and without washing they are clean. But whosoever corrupteth and defileth another man's Wife, or is defiled with an Harlot; when he ariseth up from her, though he should wash himself in the entire ocean and all the rivers, cannot be clean. Do not therefore keep any such Observances about legal and natural Purgations, as thinking you are defiled by them. Neither do you seek after Jewish separations, or perpetual washings, or purifications upon the touch of a dead body. But without such Observances assemble in the Cemeteries, reading the holy Books, and singing for the Martyrs which are fallen asleep, and for all the Saints from the beginning of the world, and for your Brethren that are asleep in the Lord, and offer the acceptable Eucharist, the representation of the royal body of Christ, both in your Churches and in the Cemeteries; and in the Funerals of the Departed accompany them with singing if they were faithful in Christ. (Greek Constitutions, book VI. ch. 29^{c}—30^{a}.)

THE FIRST COLLECTION,

OR THE

Apostolical Canons received by the Roman Church,

CONTAINETH

THE FOLLOWING CANONS OR REGULATIONS

(Can. 1—50.)

I. *Touching Ordinations.*

	Can.
How a Bishop is to be ordained	1
How a Presbyter and Deacon are to be ordained	2

II. *Touching the Oblation and the Communion.*

How the Oblation for the Sacrifice is to be made	3, 4
What of First-fruits cometh to the Clergy	5
[That a Clergyman must not cast off his Wife under pretence of Piety	6]
[That he must not meddle with worldly Cares	7]
That the Passover must not be celebrated with the Jews	8
That the Clergyman must communicate after the Oblation	9
That the Believers must stay for the Communion	10
That a Believer must not pray with an excommunicated	11, 12

III. *Touching Acts which cause Suspension or Deprivation of Clergy.*

That a suspended Clergyman must not be received elsewhere	13
That a Bishop ought not to leave his Parish	14
That no Clergyman is to do so without consent of his Bishop	15, 16
That a Clergyman cannot be twice married, or have a Concubine, or a divorced or an improper Person, or Sister-in-law, or first Cousin	17, 18, 19

Can.
That he must not be a Surety - - - - - 20
That he must not be Eunuch by Self-mutilation [for which even a Layman is excluded] - - - 21—23. [24]
That he is to be deposed, if committing Fornication, Perjury, or Stealing - - - - - - - 25, 26
[That only Readers and Singers may marry after Ordination - 27]
Also (he is to be deprived) if striking the Offender - - 28
Also if he performeth his Ministration after being deprived - 29
Also if he obtaineth his Office by Money - - - 30
Also if by worldly Power - - - - - 31
Also the Clergyman who sets up an altar against his Bishop - 32
A suspended Clergyman is not to be received by another Bishop 33
No Clergyman who is a stranger to be received without Letters Commendatory - - - - - - 34

IV. *Touching the Rights and Duties of Bishops.*

The Bishops to do nothing without him who is the first among their Nation, but look only after their own Towns and Villages; nor is he to act without them - - - 35
A Bishop who ordaineth out of his Town and the Villages belonging to it is to be deposed - - - - 36
Also he who doth not take care of his Flock - - - 37
A Synod of Bishops to be held twice a year - - - 38
The Bishop is to have the Administration of the Substance of the Church, but is not to appropriate anything to himself, except for his mere maintenance, nor to his Relations 39—41

V. *Touching other Causes of Suspension or Deprivation of Clergy.*

(*a*) Dice or Drinking [also for Laity] - - - 42, 43
Usury - - - - - - - - 44
(*b*) Praying with Heretics, or allowing a Heretic to do a part of the Service - - - - - - 45
(*c*) Recognition of heretical Baptism - - - - 46

Can.
Or rebaptizing one who is well baptized - - - 47
[A Layman who sendeth away his Wife and marrieth another, or marrieth a divorced Woman, to be suspended - - 48]
Or not baptizing into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost - 49
Or only by one Immersion - - - - - 50

THE SECOND COLLECTION

CONTAINETH THE FOLLOWING REGULATIONS.

(Can. 51—85.)

I. *Touching Causes of Suspension or Deprivation of the Clergy.*

Abstaining from Flesh and Wine, as forbidden - - - 51
Not receiving the Penitent - - - - - 52
Not partaking of Flesh and Wine on Festival Days - - 53
Eating in a Tavern - - - - - - 54
Abusing the Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon - - 55, 56
Mocking at a Deaf, or Blind, or Lame - - - - 57
A Bishop or Presbyter not taking care of his Clergy or People - 58
Or not supplying the Necessity of one of the Clergy who is in want - - - - - - - 59
Or causing Apocryphal Books to be read in the Church - 60
Former Conviction of Fornication or of a Crime - - 61
Denying the Name of Christ or of Clergymen - - - 62
Eating Flesh with the Blood or Carcass [also Laity] - - 63
Fasting on the Lord's Day or on the Sabbath - - - 64
Praying with Jews or Heretics - - - - 65
Striking or killing one in a Quarrel - - - - 66
Offering Violence to a Virgin not betrothed to him, or sending away his Wife - - - - - - 67
Receiving a second Ordination - - - - - 68

Can.

Not keeping the Fast of the Forty Days, or on Wednesdays and Fridays - - - - - - - - 69
Keeping Fasts or Festivals with the Jews - - - - 70
Doing Service in a Heathen Temple or in a Synagogue - 71
Taking away from the Church Honey or Oil - - - 72
Using Church Plate or Linen for Himself - - - 73
A Bishop not appearing before his brother Bishops if accused, on the strength of at least two good Witnesses, and thrice summoned - - - - - - - 74, 75

II. *What Persons cannot be ordained.*

A Bishop's Son or Relation, by himself - - - 76
Deaf or Blind, but not One-eyed or Lame - - 77, 78
Possessed with a Demon, until they are cleansed - - 79
One recently baptized or converted from the Gentiles - - 80
[A Bishop who it hath been said meddleth with public Administration is to be deprived - - - - - 81]
Servants (Slaves) not to be ordained without their Master's consent, and without receiving their freedom - - - 82
[A Bishop or Presbyter going into the Army - - - 83
Any one abusing the King or the Governor - - - 84]
[The Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, including the Apostolical Constitutions - - - - 85]

The Ecclesiastical Canons of the Apostles.

LET a Bishop be ordained by two or Three Bishops.

2. A Presbyter by One Bishop, as also a Deacon and the rest of the Clergy.

3. If any Bishop or Presbyter, otherwise than our Lord has ordained concerning the Sacrifice, offer other things at the Altar of God, as Honey, Milk, or strong Drink instead of Wine, any Confects, or Birds or Beasts, or Pulse, otherwise than is ordained, let him be removed.

4. At their Season it is not lawful to offer at the Altar any thing besides new Ears and fresh Grapes, and Oil for the Holy Lamp, and Incense, at the Time when the Holy Oblation is celebrated.

5. But let all other Fruits be sent to the House of the Bishop, as First-fruits for him and for the Presbyters, but not for the Altar. Now it is plain, that the Bishop and Presbyters are to distribute them to the Deacons and to the rest of the Clergy.

6. Let not a Bishop, a Priest, or a Deacon, cast off his own Wife under pretence of Piety; but if he do cast her off, let him be suspended. If he persist in it let him be removed.

7. Let not a Bishop, or Priest, or Deacon, undertake the Cares of this World; but if he do let him be removed.

8. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, shall celebrate the

Holy Day of the Passover before the Vernal Equinox of the Jews, let him be removed.

9. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, or any one in the List of the Priesthood, when the Oblation is over, doth not communicate, let him give his reason; and if it be just, let him be forgiven; but if he doth not do so, let him be suspended, as becoming the Cause of Offence to the People, and occasioning a Suspicion against him that offered, as of one that did not rightly offer.

10. All those of the Believers that enter into the Holy Church of God and hear the sacred Scriptures, but do not stay during Prayer and the Holy Communion, must be suspended, as causing Disorder in the Church.

11. If any one, even in the House, prayeth with a Person excommunicate, let him also be suspended.

12. If any Clergyman prayeth with one deprived as with a Clergyman, let himself also be deprived.

13. If any Clergyman or Layman, who is suspended, or ought not to be received, goeth away, and is received in another City without Commendatory Letters, let both those who received him and him that was received be suspended. But if he be already suspended, let his Suspension be lengthened, as lying to and deceiving the Church of God.

14. A Bishop ought not to leave his own Parish and go to another, although the Multitude should force him, unless some rational cause compelleth him, being able, perhaps, to confer more gain to those who live there, and performing something useful in the cause of Religion. But this he shall not try by himself; but after the Judgment of many Bishops, and after pressing Supplication.

15. If any Presbyter or Deacon, or any one of the List of the Clergy, leaveth his own Parish and goeth to another, and entirely removing himself continueth in that other Parish, without the Consent of his own Bishop, him we command no longer to go on in his Ministry, especially in case his Bishop calleth upon him to return, and he doth not obey, but con-

tinueth in his Disorder. However, let him communicate there as a Layman.

16. But if the Bishop, with whom they are, despiseth the Deprivation decreed against them, and receiveth them as Clergymen, let him be suspended, as a Teacher of Disorder.

17. He who has been twice married after his Baptism, or has had a Concubine, cannot be made a Bishop or Presbyter or Deacon, or, indeed, any one of the Sacerdotal List.

18. He who has married a divorced Woman, or an Harlot, or a Slave, or one belonging to the Theatre, cannot be a Bishop or a Priest, or a Deacon, or, indeed, any one of the Sacerdotal List.

19. He who has married two Sisters, or his Brother's Daughter, cannot be a Clergyman.

20. Let a Clergyman, who becometh a Surety, be deprived.

21. An Eunuch, if he be such by the Injury of Men, or his Testicles were taken away in the Persecution, or he was born such and yet is worthy of the Episcopate, let him be made a Bishop.

22. He who has disabled himself, let him not be made a Clergyman; for he is a Self-murderer and an Enemy to the Creation of God.

23. If any one who is of the Clergy disable himself, let him be deprived, for he is a Murderer of himself.

24. A Layman who disableth himself, let him be separated for Three Years, for he layeth a Snare for his own Life.

25. A Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who is taken in Fornication, or Perjury, or Stealing, let him be deprived; but not suspended, for the Scripture sayeth, "*Thou shalt not avenge twice for the same Crime by Affliction.*"

26. In like manner also as to the rest of the Clergy.

27. Of those who come into the Clergy unmarried, we permit only the Readers and Singers, if they have a mind, to marry afterwards.

28. We command that a Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who striketh the Believers that offend, or the Unbelievers who

do wickedly, and thinketh to terrify them by such Means, be deprived; for our Lord hath nowhere taught us such Things. On the contrary, *When himself was stricken he did not strike again, when he was reviled he reviled not again, when he suffered he threatened not.*

29. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who is deprived justly for manifest Crimes, doth venture to meddle with that Ministration which was once intrusted to him, let the same Person be entirely cut off from the Church.

30. If any Bishop obtaineth that Dignity by Money, or even a Presbyter or Deacon, let him and he that ordained him be deprived, and let him be entirely cut off from Communion, as Simon Magus was by Peter.

31. If any Bishop maketh use of the Rulers of this World, and by their Means obtaineth to be a Bishop of a Church, let him be deprived and suspended, and all that communicate with him.

32. If any Presbyter despiseth his own Bishop, and assembleth separately and fixeth another Altar, when he has nothing to condemn in his Bishop, either as to Piety or Righteousness, let him be deprived as an ambitious Person, for he is a Tyrant; and the rest of the Clergy, whoever join themselves to him. And let the Laity be suspended. But let these things be done after one, and a second, or even a third Admonition from the Bishop.

33. If any Presbyter or Deacon be put under Suspension by his Bishop, it is not lawful for any other to receive him, but him only who put him under Suspension; unless it happeneth that he who put him under Suspension die.

34. Do not ye receive any Stranger, whether Bishop or Presbyter or Deacon, without Letters Commendatory, and when such are offered let them be examined; and if they be Preachers of Piety let them be received; but if not, supply their Wants, but do not receive them to Communion; for many Things are done surreptitiously.

35. The Bishops of every Nation ought to know who is the

First among them, and him they ought to esteem as their Head, and not to do any great Thing without his Consent, but every one to manage only the affairs that belong to his own Parish, and the Country places and Villages subject to it. But let him not either do any Thing without the Consent of all; for it is by this means there will be Unanimity, and God will be glorified by Christ in the Holy Spirit.

36. A Bishop must not venture to ordain out of his own Bounds for Cities or Country places (Villages) that are not subject to him. But if he be convicted of having done so without the Consent of such as governed those Cities or Country places, let him be deprived, both he and those whom he hath ordained.

37. If any Bishop that is ordained doth not undertake his Office, nor take Care of the People committed to him, let him be suspended, until he do undertake; and in the like manner a Presbyter or a Deacon. But if he goeth and is not received, not because of the Want of his own Consent, but because of the ill Temple of the People, let him continue Bishop; but let the Clergy of that City be suspended, because they have not taught that disobedient People better.

38. Let a Synod of Bishops be held twice in the Year, and let them ask one another the Doctrines of Piety, and let them determine the ecclesiastical Disputes that happen. Once in the fourth Week of Pentecost, and again on the Twelfth of the Month Hyperberetæus, that is, according to the Romans, on the fourth before the Ides of October.

39. Let the Bishop have the Care of the Ecclesiastical Revenues, and administer them as in the Presence of God. But it is not lawful for him to appropriate any part of them to himself, or to give the Things of God to his own Kindred; if they be poor let him support them as Poor; but let him not under such Pretences alienate the Revenues of the Church.

40. Let not the Presbyters and Deacons do any Thing without the Consent of the Bishop; for it is he who is intrusted

with the People of the Lord, and will be required to give an account of their Souls. Let the proper Goods of the Bishop, if he has any, and those belonging to the Lord, be openly distinguished, that he may have Power when he dieth to leave his own Goods as he pleaseth, that under pretence of the Ecclesiastical Revenues the Bishop's own may not come short, who sometimes has a Wife and Children, or Kinsfolk, or Servants. For this is just before God and Men, that neither the Church suffer any loss by the not knowing which Revenues are the Bishop's own, nor his Kindred under Pretence of the Church be undone, or his Relations fall into Law Suits, and so his Death be liable to Reproach.

41. We command that the Bishop have Power over the Goods of the Church; for if he be intrusted with the precious Souls of Men, much more ought he to administer the Property, that they all be distributed to those in want, according to his Authority, by the Presbyters and Deacons, and be used for their Support, with the Fear of God, and with all Reverence; he is also to partake of those Things he wanteth, if he doth want them, for his necessary Occasions and those of the Brethren who live with him as Guests, that they may not by any means be in Straits. For the Law of God appointed, that those who waited at the Altar should be maintained by the Altar, since not so much as a Soldier doth at any time bear Arms against the Enemies at his own Charges.

42. A Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who indulgeth himself in Dice or Drinking, either let him leave off those Practices, or let him be deprived.

43. If a Subdeacon, a Reader, or a Singer, doth the like, either let him leave off or let him be suspended; and so for one of the Laity.

44. A Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who requireth Usury of those he lendeth to, either let him leave off to do so or let him be deprived.

45. A Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who only prayeth with Heretics, let him be suspended; but if he also induceth

them to perform any Part of the Office of a Clergyman, let him be deprived.

46. We command that a Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who receiveth (as valid) the Baptism or the Sacrifice of Heretics, be deprived: *For what Agreement is there between Christ and Belial, or what Part has a Believer with an Infidel?*

47. If a Bishop or Presbyter rebaptizeth him who has had true Baptism, or doth not baptize him who is polluted by the Ungodly, let him be deprived as deriding the Cross and the Death of Christ, and not distinguishing between real Priests and counterfeit ones.

48. If a Layman divorceth his own Wife and taketh another, or one divorced by another, let him be suspended.

49. If any Bishop or Presbyter doth not baptize according to the Lord's Constitution, into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but into three Beings without beginning, or into three Sons, or three Comforters, let him be deprived.

50. If any Bishop or Presbyter doth not perform Three Immersions of the one Admission, but One Immersion which is given into the Death of Christ, let him be deprived; for the Lord did not say, *Baptize into my Death*, but, "*Go ye and make Disciples of all Nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" Do ye therefore, O Bishops, baptize thrice into the one Father and Son and Holy Ghost, according to the Will of Christ and our Constitution by the Spirit.

---

51. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, or indeed any one of the Sacerdotal Order, abstaineth from Flesh and Wine, not for his own exercise, but out of Hatred of the things, forgetting that *All things were very good*, and that *God made man, male and female*, and blasphemously abuseth the Creation, either let him reform or let

him be deprived, and be cast out of the Church; and the same for one of the Laity.

52. If any Bishop or Presbyter doth not receive him that returneth from his Sin, but rejecteth him, let him be deprived, because he grieveth Christ, who sayeth, "*There is joy in Heaven over one Sinner that repenteth.*"

53. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon doth not on Festival Days partake of Flesh or Wine, let him be deprived, as *having a seared Conscience,* and becoming a Cause of Scandal to many.

54. If any one of the Clergy be taken eating in a Tavern, let him be suspended, excepting when he is forced to bait at an Inn upon the Road.

55. If any one of the Clergy abuseth the Bishop unjustly, let him be deprived; for sayeth the Scripture: "*Thou shalt not speak Evil of the Ruler of thy People.*"

56. If any one of the Clergy abuseth a Presbyter or a Deacon, let him be separated.

57. If any one of the Clergy mocketh at a Deaf or Blind Man, or at one lame of his Feet, let him be suspended; and the like for the Laity.

58. A Bishop or Presbyter, who taketh no Care of the Clergy or People, and doth not instruct them in Piety, let him be separated, and if he continue in his Negligence, let him be deprived.

59. If any Bishop or Presbyter, when any one of the Clergy is in want, doth not supply his Necessity, let him be suspended; and if he continue in it, let him be deprived as having killed his Brother.

60. If any one causeth publicly to be read in the Church the spurious Books of the Ungodly, as if they were holy, to the Destruction of the People and of the Clergy, let him be deprived.

61. If there be an Accusation against a Christian for Fornication or Adultery, or any other forbidden Action, and he be convicted, let him not be promoted into the Clergy.

62. If any one of the Clergy, for Fear of Men, as of a Jew, or a Gentile, or an Heretic, shall deny the Name of Christ, let him be suspended; but if he deny the Name of a Clergyman, let him be deprived; but when he repenteth, let him be received as one of the Laity.

63. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, or indeed any one of

the Sacerdotal Order, eateth Flesh with the Blood of its Life, or that which is torn by Beasts, or which died of itself, let him be deprived; for this the Law itself has forbidden; but if he be one of the Laity, let him be suspended.

64. If any one of the Clergy be found to fast on the Lord's Day, or on the Sabbath Day, excepting one only, let him be deprived; but if he be one of the Laity, let him be suspended.

65. If any one either of the Clergy or Laity entereth into a Synagogue of the Jews or Heretics to pray, let him be deprived or suspended.

66. If any of the Clergy striketh one in a Quarrel, and killeth him by that one Stroke, let him be deprived on account of his Rashness; but if he be one of the Laity, let him be suspended.

67. If any one has offered Violence to a Virgin not betrothed, and keepeth her, let him be suspended; but it is not lawful for Him to take another to Wife, but he must retain her whom he has chosen, although she be poor.

68. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon receiveth a second Ordination from any one, let him be deprived and he who ordained him, unless he can show that his former Ordination was from the Heretics; for those that are either baptized or ordained by such as these can be neither Christians nor Clergymen.

69. If any Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, or Reader, or Singer doth not fast the Fast of Forty Days, or the Fourth Day of the Week, and the Day of the Preparation, let him be deprived, except he be hindered by weakness of Body; but if he be one of the Laity, let him be suspended.

70. If any Bishop, or any other of the Clergy, fasteth with the Jews, or keepeth the Festivals with them, or accepteth of the Presents from their Festivals, as unleavened Bread, or any such thing, let him be deprived; but if he be one of the Laity, let him be suspended.

71. If any Christian carrieth Oil into a Heathen Temple or into a Synagogue of the Jews, or lighteth up Lamps in their Festivals, let him be suspended.

72. If any one, either of the Clergy or Laity, taketh away from the Holy Church Honey or Oil, let him be suspended, and let him add the fifth part to that which he took away.

73. A Vessel of Silver or Gold, or Linen, which is sanctified, let

no one appropriate it to his own Use, for it is unjust; but if any one be caught, let him be punished with Suspension.

74. If a Bishop be accused of any Crime by credible and Faithful Persons, it is necessary that he be cited by the Bishops; and if he cometh and maketh his Apology, and yet is convicted, let his Punishment be determined; but if, when he is cited, he doth not obey, let him be cited a second Time by two Bishops sent to him; but if even then he despiseth them, and will not come, let the Synod pass what Sentence they please against him; that he may not appear to gain advantage by avoiding their Judgment.

75. Do not ye receive an Heretic in a Testimony against a Bishop, nor a Christian if he be single, for the Law sayeth: "*In the mouth of two or three Witnesses every Word shall be established.*"

76. A Bishop must not gratify his Brother, or his Son, or any other Kinsman, with the Episcopal Dignity, or ordain whom he pleaseth; for it is not just to make Heirs to Episcopacy, and to gratify human Affections in divine Matters; for we must not put the Church of God under the Laws of Inheritance. But if any one shall do so, let his Ordination be invalid, and let him be punished with Suspension.

77. If any one be maimed in an eye, or lame of his Leg, but is worthy of Episcopal Dignity, let him be made a Bishop; for it is not a Blemish of the Body that can defile him, but the Pollution of the Soul.

78. But if he be deaf and blind, let him not be made a Bishop, not as being a defiled Person, but that the Ecclesiastical Affairs may not be hindered.

79. If any one hath a Demon, let him not be made one of the Clergy; nay, let him not pray with the Believers; but when he is cleansed, let him be received, and, if he be worthy, let him be ordained.

80. It is not right to ordain him Bishop immediately, who is just come in from the Gentiles and baptized or from a wicked Conversation; for it is unjust that he who hath not yet afforded any Trial of himself should be a Teacher of others, unless it anywhere happeneth by Divine Grace.

81. We have said, that a Bishop ought not to let himself into public Administrations, but to attend on all Opportunities upon the necessary Affairs of the Church. Either, therefore, let him agree

not to do so, or let him be deprived. For, *No one can serve two Masters*, according to the Lord's Admonition.

82. We do not permit Servants to be ordained into the Clergy without their Master's Consent, for this would grieve those that owned them. For such a Practice would occasion the Subversion of Families. But if at any time a Servant appeareth worthy to be ordained into a high Office, such as our *Onesimus* appeared to be, and if his Master alloweth of it, and giveth him his Freedom, and dismisseth him from his House, let him be ordained.

83. Let a Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, who goeth to the Army, and desireth to retain both the Roman Government and the Sacerdotal Administration, be deprived, for: *The Things of Cæsar belong to Cæsar, and the Things of God to God.*

84. Whosoever shall abuse the King or the Governor unjustly, let him suffer Punishment; and if he be a Clergyman, let him be deprived; but if he be a Layman, let him be suspended.

85. Let the following Books be esteemed venerable and holy, by you, both of the Clergy and Laity. Of the Old Covenant: the five Books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, one of Joshua the Son of Nun, one of the Judges, one of Ruth, four of the Kings, two of the Chronicles, two of Ezra, one of Esther, [one of Judith,] three of the Maccabees, one of Job, one hundred and fifty Psalms, three Books of Solomon, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs, sixteen Prophets. And besides these, take care that your young Persons learn the Wisdom of the very learned Sirach. But our sacred Books, that is, those of the new Covenant, are these: the four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the fourteen Epistles of Paul, two Epistles of Peter, three of John, one of James, one of Jude; two Epistles of Clement, and the Constitutions dedicated to you the Bishops, by me Clement, in eight books, which it is not fit to publish before all, because of the Mysteries contained in them, and the Acts of us the Apostles.

Let these Canonical Rules be established by us for you, O ye Bishops, and if you continue to observe them, ye shall be saved, and shall have Peace; but if you be disobedient, you shall be punished, and have everlasting War one with another, and undergo a Penalty suitable to your Disobedience.

Now God, who alone is unbegotten, and the Maker of the whole

World, unite you all through his Peace in the Holy Spirit, perfect you unto every good Work, immovable, unblamable, and unreprovable, and vouchsafe to you Eternal Life with us through the Mediation of his beloved Son, Jesus Christ, our God and Saviour; with whom Glory be to Thee, the God over all, and the Father, in the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, now and always, and for ever and ever. Amen.

The End of the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles by Clement, which are the Catholic Doctrine.

NOTES

TO

THE CHURCH- AND HOUSE-BOOK OF THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH.

TO THE FIRST BOOK.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE ON THE CRITICAL WORKS RESPECTING THE ORDINANCES OF BAPTISM.

The seventh volume of *Augusti's* Denkwürdigkeiten (1825) deserves to be consulted. On the particular itself we have remarkable Monographs by two truly learned and critical divines of the German Roman-Catholic School:

Dr. *Fr. Brenner*, Geschichtliche Darstellung der Verrichtung der Taufe, von Christus bis auf unsere Zeiten. 1818.

Dr. *J. B. Hirscher*, Ueber das Verhältniss des Evangeliums zu der theologischen Scholastik der neuesten Zeit im katholischen Deutschland. 1823.

There is besides a very learned exposition by a Lutheran divine:

Höfling, Das Sacrament der Taufe. Erl. 1846.

The works of Brenner and Hirscher deserve particular credit for the frankness and intrepidity of their researches. Drey's book on the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons, frequently quoted in our Second Volume, also claims respect, not only on account of its true learning, but also of the author's evident sincerity. For instance, where he mentions the Ordinance that the baptized is to repeat the Lord's Prayer before the whole Congregation, he observes that this is an acknowledgment of the general priesthood of every Christian,

the Catechumen acting as priest in that significant ceremony. This is in the spirit of the words of St. Jerome, in his "Dialogue against Lucifer" (ch. 2.): "Sacerdotium laici, id est baptisma."

Note A.

on chrysostomus' record of the ancient order of baptism in the church of antioch.

Neander, in his Johannes Chrysostomus, has proved (p. 180., compare notes p. 331—338.) that Chrysostom wrote these sermons when he was Presbyter of the Church of Antioch. His record is therefore a document of the formularies of that Church; and whoever reads it will feel that he speaks of them as a traditional text, not the produce of his generation.

The corresponding prayer in the eighth book of the Greek Constitutions (Augusti, Denkw. vii. p. 138—141.) is evidently nothing but an enlarged and detailed remodelling of that ancient formulary. It is there followed by a formulary for the prayer which the Bishop pronounces when about to give the blessing to the Catechumens.

Note B.

on the creed of the apostles.

Introduction.

What is called the Creed of the Apostles, or the Apostolic Creed, is a formula grown out of the baptismal instruction given by Christ to the Apostles, according to the conclusion of our Gospel of St. Matthew (xxviii. 19.):

> "Go ye and make all nations disciples, baptizing (immersing) them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

We find this evangelical form of the confession of the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit, almost in its primitive simplicity, recorded by the baptismal order of the Church of Alexandria, as will be proved more fully when we come to the criticism of the text itself.

In the Church of Rome we find an amplification, which is a nearer approach to our present Creed. The Greek text of the Apostolic Constitutions gives us an overcharged amplification of the same form. But to whatever extent it may have been amplified, this pledge of faith never was intended, in the ante-Nicene Church, to express the philosophical consciousness of the Church as discussed in the Schools. The Creed of the Apostles gradually became an epitome of the leading facts related in the Gospel as to the Father, Son, and Spirit. The second article for instance exhibits in short phrases what is related in the Gospels as to the life of Jesus; and the Coptic ritual shows that this amplification first existed as a separate supplement, to be recited after the general pledge. The consciousness of the connection between the belief in the Church and her destiny, and the confession of the Spirit, gradually formed the third article.

The epitome has no value but its faithfulness, and no authority but that of its origin.

Still the point round which these epitomized elements have crystallized is that which constitutes the whole doctrinal consciousness of the ancient Church: the belief in the Father, the Son, and the Spirit.

This, in the mind of the Primitive Church, was the only real doctrinal point respecting which the historical records of Christianity are in the highest sense authoritative. The rest was considered by that Church as disciplinary, subject to the development of the Spirit in the congregation: so in Baptism itself, so in Communion, so in all which belongs to ethical philosophy, and to the combination of Christian ideas with history and science.

The most remarkable and important character of the Apostles' Creed is consequently this, that it purports to be nothing but an epitome of the New Testament based upon the belief in that divine threefoldness. This is what characterizes Christianity in the history of the religions of the world. Philosophical formularies may take that form of a confession of belief, of a Creed: but they stand upon their own ground, and belong to the Schools, not to the general consciousness of the Church; nothing is farther from the spirit and intentions of the ancient Church, than to make such school-formularies pledges of communion with Christ.

The false, uncritical, unhistorical, and in great part dishonest, patchwork of the seventeenth century, has brought forward many formularies as ante-Nicene Creeds, which either are not ante-Nicene

at all, or philosophical and doctrinal formulas, not historical and baptismal (catechetic) epitomes. It is our duty to eliminate both. We must not, with Bull, Pearson, and Bingham, admit among ante-Nicene Church Creeds, and as the Creed of the Alexandrian Church, that formulary which Arius and his friend presented to Constantine, and which Socrates has preserved. It is evidently the doctrinal formulary of that learned party. Nor can we admit the formulary of Gregory the Thaumaturg, which we know only through post-Nicene writers, and which is a doctrinal fiction, a metaphysical formulary received by him (says Gregory of Nyssa) in a vision, and not an ecclesiastical confession at all. Nor must we quote that of Lucian the Confessor, which, if genuine, is, again, nothing but the speculation of one of the theological schools, and is moreover only known through Hilarius, and bears on the face of it the stamp of interpolation. Nor can we admit, on the authority of Cassianus, and against all internal evidence, a similar formulary to be the Creed of the Church of Antioch; we do not know, even, that it represents the theological formula of some of its divines. Least of all can an honest criticism admit as Creeds of the ancient Church those formularies which are found in the so-called Liturgies of St. James, and St. Peter, and St. Mark; all forgeries, and (like the Liturgy) foisted into the eighth book of the Constitutions, posterior to the Council of Ephesus. It would be superfluous to say a word on this subject after the researches of Neander, Rothe, Hagenbach, and many other German critics.

But if these fictions or speculations must be banished from the sanctuary of the Church of the second and third centuries, we are enabled, on the other hand, to give some real Church Creeds of the ante-Nicene age, which have since come to light, and they will assist us perhaps in forming a better conception of the stages through which our Creeds have passed.

All the historical Creeds, called Apostolic, necessarily had a tendency to become gradually more extended, together with the consciousness of the Church respecting her faith, in consequence of certain heretical additions to the doctrine respecting Father, Son, and Spirit.

These additions are interpolations as to the form, and must rather be considered as such than as falsifications. Some, as it appears, were originally intended merely as illustrations by juxta-position. But in all cases it is interesting to know, or to find out, what the original form of a given Church Creed was. It takes off the

doctrinal sharpness of some doubtful points, and reduces all these formularies to their real value, as baptismal epitomes of the evangelical accounts, grouped round the confession of Father, Son, and Spirit, prescribed by the Gospel of St. Matthew for baptism. It also shows which is the right interpretation of the single articles. No one who admits the truth of this can do otherwise than lament the blindness which makes out of such Creeds a new revelation, or imposes their literal expression upon the Christian conscience as a rule of faith, collateral with, or even superior to, the true Apostolic tradition contained in the New Testament.

All that has been said about the mystery respecting the Creed of the Apostles as a secret formula, and therefore learned by heart, not read out of book, is sheer nonsense. What secret doctrine or mystery could there be veiled in an epitome of the words of Scripture? The Creed was not given to the Catechumens in writing, that they might learn it by heart, as one of the Fathers says expressly. It was said, not sung: very naturally; so was the Scripture of which it was an epitome. Still, at a later period, the schoolmen found mysterious reasons even for that: another theological fiction!

I. *The Creed of the Church of Rome.*

We know the primitive form of this Creed from various undoubted documents which the reader will find discussed in Usserius De Symbolis: particularly from an Anglo-Saxon Psalterium of the year 703. St. Augustin explains this text in his treatise De Fide et Symbolo; we read the same text in Greek in Epiphanius (Hær. 72.), as inserted by one of the opponents of Arius, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, into his formulary.

The two articles,

"he descended into hell,"

and

"The Communion of Saints,"

indeed, are not found in any genuine form of Confession of this age. The first was inserted as an explanation of the preceding "he was buried," the other in explanation of the "holy Church," as being the congregation of Believers, united amongst each other by Christ.

The following text exhibits the difference between the primitive

form as given in our Text-Book, which most probably was fixed in the earlier part or the middle of the second century, and originally written in Greek, and the later formulary of the Latin Church as the Reformed Churches received it. The additions are put between brackets.

I believe in God the Father Almighty:
[*Maker of Heaven and Earth:*]
And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord:
Who was [*conceived*] by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,
Suffered under Pontius Pilate,
Was crucified [*dead*] and buried,
[*He descended into Hell,*]
The third day he rose again from the dead,
He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of [*God*] the Father [*Almighty*],
From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost:
The Holy [*Catholic*] Church:
[*The Communion of Saints:*]
The forgiveness of sins:
The resurrection of the body:
[*And the life everlasting.*]
Amen.

II. *The Creed of the Church of Alexandria.*

This is only known to us from the Coptic Constitutions of the Apostles, edited in 1848. Its form there is the following:

I believe in the only true God, the Father Almighty:
And in his only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour:
And in the Holy Spirit, the Giver of life:
the Trinity of the same Substance:
One Sovereignty, One Kingdom, One Faith, One Baptism:
in the holy Catholic Apostolic Church:
in the life everlasting.
Amen.

It is evident at once that the "Τριὰς ομοούσιος" is an interpolation. So is also the following line, which is a confused and abstract

imitation of the grand words of St. Paul (Eph. iv. 5.): "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in all." The natural construction of the whole article reappears only in the next lines:

in the holy Catholic Apostolic Church,
in the life everlasting.

These two were therefore the first additions, and the two intermediate lines later insertions. Still the first of those two concluding lines is in its present form not primitive, and the second is not found in the genuine forms of the Apostolic Creeds of our age. The necessary consequence, therefore, is, that the whole of the latter part is not primitive.

The subjoined texts show the gradual progress of extension, as the present text exhibits the final interpolation.

1. *The Primitive Form.*

I believe in the only true God, the Father Almighty:
And in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour:
And in the Holy Spirit, the Giver of Life.

2. *The First Addition.*

I believe in the only true God, the Father Almighty:
And in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour:
And in the Holy Spirit, the Giver of life,
In the Holy Church,
In the Life everlasting.

3. *The Second Addition, placed between the original Text and the Appendix.*

I believe in the only true God, the Father Almighty:
And in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour:
And in the Holy Spirit, the Giver of life,
One Sovereignty, One Kingdom, One Faith, One Baptism.
in the Holy Church,
in the life everlasting.

III. *The Apostles' Creed according to the Seventh Book of the Apostolic Constitutions.*

The authority of the Coptic Baptismal Canons, as being the most authentic text of the most ancient chapter of the Apostolic Ordi-

nances, would suffice to show that this formulary is not a historical, but a scholastic one. The examination of the contents leads to the same conclusion. I have therefore given it merely as an Appendix. But, on the other hand, I believe it to be a scholastic formulary of our age. It expresses, on the whole, the learned consciousness of the Church about the middle of the third century, and is as little Arian as it is Athanasian. Compared with the formularies of Hippolytus and Origen, it shows its character as being decidedly more universal, and less scholastic. After the words, "the first-born of the whole creation," only a portion of the manuscripts have the watchword of the school "not created."

TO THE THIRD BOOK.

Note C.

THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF THE PSALMS AND HYMNS OF THE APOSTOLICAL CHURCH.

Critical Introduction.

It has been already observed in the First Volume (Letter V. to Archd. Hare) that all Christian Church poetry has emanated, as to the form, from one of two great sources of Christian thought: the Hebrew or Semitic, and the Hellenic and Roman or Japhetic, elements. The Christians first composed and sang imitations of the Hebrew Psalms, which were either simple centos, strings of Psalm verses, or entirely new compositions conceived in the antiphonic spirit of Hebrew poetry, and therefore without any metre, and meant to be intoned or sung alternately. As to this sort of composition, the Psalmodic verse of the Angels and the three Psalms or Canticles of the New Testament, as preserved in St. Luke's Gospel, had led the way. We give them in the Analecta in this form. Besides them we possess four compositions of this kind: real gems, genuine relics of ancient, congregational, and domestic hymnology. The first three of them have been transmitted to us by the Alexandrian MS. of the

Bible, as an Appendix to the Psalms of the Old Testament. They form part of the Bible, preceded by the last Psalm of the Old Testament, and followed by the first chapter of Job.

The first (see A. I. p. 141.) is preceded by the rubric: Ὕμνος ἑωθινός, Morning Hymn, and is written in lyric lines. But there is no trace in it of any metre; and indeed it would be quite inexplicable, if we found in it any but the primitive Hebrew element. For this Morning Hymn of the Primitive Church is evidently alluded to by Pliny, and we find it early used and held in high veneration by the whole Church. It must therefore in its substance be as old as the Johannean writings, if not older. But it is indeed easily reducible to the antiphonic system of Hebrew poetry.

The Greek Church has preserved this relic in its Liturgy as the Ὕμνος ἀγγελικός, the Angelic Hymn, which name is derived from the introductory verse of the Song of the Angels at the birth of Christ. (Luk. ii. 14.) About the year 380, Hilarius, it appears, transferred this Hymn, in his liturgical compositions and collections, from the Greek to the Latin Church, according to a text not entirely concordant with that of the Alexandrian Codex. The Roman Church introduced the Hymn into the first part of the Communion Service, as a Psalm of Thanksgiving (Doxologia magna or major) after the Absolution; it appears here already as prose, and with some remarkable variations most likely according to the text of Hilarius. The text of the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 47.) is also printed as prose, and with variations betraying the hand of one who wished to make that psalmodic effusion a sheer prose prayer, with some doctrinal phrases. The juxtaposition of the three texts will best explain the details.

But that juxtaposition also gives us the clue to the original form of the Hymn. Of the two lines

καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα
κύριε ὁ θεός

the first is wanting, and the second is made to form the beginning of the Christological part of the Hymn. The Constitutions omit equally the words, "And the Holy Spirit;" but, as to the words "Lord God," they give them as the conclusion of the first part of the Hymn which praises the Father. Now this arrangement, were it not supported by the official Latin text, would prove nothing; as the original text has evidently been paraphrased, and may have been tampered with in the Constitutions. But who can believe that the Roman Church would have omitted anything she found in the Greek

text which she adopted for her Latin service? Finally, the whole construction of the Hymn shows that those lines are a very clumsy interruption of the Patrologic and the Christologic parts. The intercalation of the words, "and the Holy Spirit," was intended to make this ancient document of Christian piety and devotion express the faith in Father, Son, and Spirit. The Latin text has made the same intercalation, but not here: it is placed at the end. This circumstance constitutes the one an evidence against the other, and proves that both texts have undergone some change. Now the two invocations of the Spirit being removed, the question arises: What becomes of the words "Lord God?" As the Alexandrian MS. is without interpunction, or division of strophes, it is impossible to decide from it whether, after the invocation of the Spirit had been added, the words κύριε ὁ θεός were understood as forming the conclusion of the preceding sentence, or constituting the beginning of the second, the Christological part. The later Church has undoubtedly referred the words to Christ, as heading the invocation of Him. But certainly this in itself points to the post-Nicene period, when such expressions as the ancient Church never dreamt of applying to Christ, were studiously applied (or made to apply) to Him.

Now, if the words κύριε ὁ θεός must have belonged to the first part, it is clear that they were, after the interpolation of the Spirit, understood as referring to Father, Son, and Spirit; forming a concluding comprehensive invocation of the Deity. But it is also clear that such an interpretation became only possible after the interpolation. Before that intercalation, they must have stood before the words, "Thou, the only begotten Son, Jesus Christ," and have referred to the Father. As soon as we restore them to this their original place, we have a solemn conclusion of the address to the Father, and a natural beginning of the invocation of the Divine Word, Jesus the Christ. Our restored text speaks for itself. The Hymn consists of a double invocation; first of the Father, and then of Jesus the Christ. In this way only we can perfectly understand Pliny's words: "they sing, alternately between themselves (in alternate choirs), and praise Christ as if he were a God" (tanquam Deum), not "as their God."

As to the other variations between the Greek and Latin text, external and internal evidence speaks in favour of the first. That in the last words is of some importance: "in the glory of God," instead of "for the glory of God."

Upon these grounds rests the entire restoration of the primitive text, which we subjoin to that of the MS.

The second and third Psalmodic Hymns (see A. II. III. p. 141. 143.)

are already in the Alexandrian MS. jumbled into one, which has produced a singular misunderstanding on the part of Usher. He has called the whole "The Evening Hymn," evidently as the counterpart of what precedes in the MS. This guess, indeed, is supported by the concluding words; but is irreconcilable with the second verse: "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin." On the contrary the first three verses, concluding with "Amen," form another Morning Hymn, originally used perhaps for private devotion. The composition is very simple: the prayer just quoted is placed between two Psalm verses. The "Amen" marks the conclusion.

The remainder constitutes the Evening Psalm of the ancient Church. This is merely a cento of verses and hemistichs of Psalms, or that sort of composition which has given birth to many of our most ancient and beautiful antiphonies. There is a spiritual and intellectual feeling visible in the selection and in the composition.

Of this Evening Psalm there is no trace in the later liturgies: but the short verse which constitutes what is original in the preceding Morning Psalm, "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep us this day without sin," has been preserved to us in the Psalm of Thanksgiving of the Western Church, which we call the Te Deum.

The Apostolical Constitutions (VII. 48.) give the Song of Simeon as an Evening Hymn. In our MSS. it is printed as the second part of a Psalmodic composition which forms the counterpart of the primitive Morning Hymn, or the Greater Doxology, and is an imitation of the same. This composition proves that the words, "We praise thee," &c., were considered as a separate piece. The preceding words of the Angelic song were placed at the head of the later composition, as a sacred text. This arrangement is common both to the Morning and the Evening Psalm of the early Christians. One may conjecture that this imitation refers to a still simpler form of that beautiful Morning Thanksgiving, but of this there is no documentary proof. (See C. p. 144)

These are all the authentic and genuine remains we possess of the ante-Nicene psalmody and hymnology of Christendom, as far as it adopted the Hebrew form. Such then are the Psalmodic compositions of the ancient Church in the stricter sense.

But we have at least one composition of Hellenic source: the Ave-Maria Hymn, as we might call it, from the present Italian custom of marking by prayer the complete setting of the sun, or more accurately the moment when the candles are lighted. (See B. p. 144.) It is also called the "Hymn of the Kindling of the Lamp" (Ὕμνος τοῦ λυχνικοῦ).

THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY

Usher (whose notes on the Alexandrian MS. we subjoin) has not only proved that Basilius the Great (or whoever may be the author of the remarkable and learned treatise on the Holy Spirit) refers to the "Thanksgiving of the Lighting of Candles" as an "ancient pious voice of the people," but he has also happily suggested that the beginning may refer to the custom of the ancient Greeks, who, according to Varro, said when the light was brought in, *φῶς ἀγαθόν*, "the good light" or "the light is good;" as the Italians say, on the same occasion, "Felicissima sera." The Christians of the Greek tongue transferred these words, with a slight variation; suiting the prayer and its object to the Hymn with which they greeted the Evening Star and the Domestic Lamp, elevating thence their thoughts to the eternal light of the soul. Usher is wrong in supposing that the *Ἐπιλύχνιος ψαλμός* and the *Ὕμνος τοῦ λυχνικοῦ* are the same; the first is Davidic, the latter Hellenic; but they were probably used indiscriminately.

PART II.

THE

INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION.

THE

INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION.

BOOK I.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL AND BAPTISMAL VOW.

I.

THE PICTURE.

The Apostolical Church made the School the connecting link between herself and the world. The object of this education was admission into the free society and brotherhood of the Christian community. The Church adhered rigidly to the principle, as constituting the true purport of the baptism ordained by Christ, that no one can be a member of the communion of Saints, but by his own free act and deed, his own solemn vow made in presence of the Church. It was with this understanding that the candidate for baptism was immersed in water, and admitted as a brother, upon his confession of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It understood baptism, therefore, in the exact sense of the First Epistle of St. Peter (iii. 21.), not as being a mere bodily purification, but as a vow made to God with a good conscience, through faith in Jesus Christ. Fustin Martyr calls baptism a dedication of ourselves to God. This vow was preceded by a confession of Christian faith, made in the face of the Church, in which the Catechumen expressed that faith in Christ and in the sufficiency of the salvation offered by Him. It was a vow to live for the time to

come to God and for his neighbour, not to the world and for Self; a vow of faith in his becoming a child of God through the communion with his only begotten Son in the Holy Ghost; a vow of the most solemn kind, for life and for death. The keeping of this pledge was the condition of continuance in the Church: its infringement entailed repentance or excommunication. All Church discipline was based upon this voluntary pledge, and the responsibility thereby self-imposed. But how could such a vow be received without examination? How could such examination be passed without instruction and observation?

As a general rule, the ancient Church fixed three years for this preparation, supposing the candidate, whether heathen or Jew, to be competent to receive it. With Christian children the condition was the same, except that the term of probation was curtailed according to circumstances. Pedobaptism, in the more modern sense, meaning thereby baptism of new-born infants, with the vicarious promises of parents or other sponsors, was utterly unknown to the early Church; not only down to the end of the second, but indeed to the middle of the third century. We shall show, in a subsequent page, how, towards the close of the second century, this practice originated in the baptism of children of a more advanced age.

Hence we find in the Christian school of that period, four great acts, three of which were common both to the new converts and to Christian children; previous examination of the Jewish or heathen candidates who presented themselves; instruction and examination immediately before immersion and the taking of the vow; and lastly, that ceremony itself.

I. *Previous Examination.*

Upon this point we possess an entire document in its original shape, which we find again, in a precisely similar form, in the Churches of Alexandria and of Antioch, as the expression of a primitive and universal ecclesiastical custom. Every member of

the community might present to the Bishop or Presbyters those who offered themselves for instruction in Christianity, and might give such testimony or guarantee as was required before the examination took place. Almost all the social questions of the day came under discussion during these examinations, and eminently among them the important one of slavery. The resolution at which the Church arrived on this point bears the impress of high moral faith and courage, as well as of Christian wisdom. The slave, even of a heathen, was not admitted unless he promised to deserve his master's good-will by honest behaviour, and to abandon every practice which was incompatible with his Christian vow and confession of faith in the proffered salvation. He was to be taught that it became a Christian to fulfil all righteousness. Moreover, he was to abstain from all sacrificial meat, and not to give himself up to any form of that immorality to which slavery offered a temptation, and which heathenism had almost sanctioned. But even the master of a slave was inadmissible into, or incapable of remaining in, the Communion, unless he gave his slaves, of both sexes, an opportunity of abandoning personal impurity, and of entering into married life. All the moral philosophers and national economists of the day (and the Romans were in this practically and theoretically eminent) must have held this to be a most serious, if not unjustifiable, attack on the rights of property, ever the most sacred in the eyes of the Romans, the divine right of the Sovereign Man.

Idolatrous superstitions and impure trades were disqualifications, if not abandoned at once. This again was a general attack upon the deep-seated irregularities of the heathen world. It may be enough to mention here omens and all the superstitions connected with the evil eye, and protection against charms (*gilatura*, *fascinus*), which are still as prevalent, in all the South of Europe, as they were during the middle ages, and which are studiously encouraged even in all the Romanic countries; in most of them, indeed, are made use of as an engine of the state police.

A person possessed, *i. e.* subject to paroxysms of frenzy, lunacy, or epilepsy, could only be admitted in very pressing

exceptional cases. As to military men, the ancient Church was as far from rejecting them as John the Baptist was, whose words are quoted in our Text-Book. That document concludes with a beautiful addition of the compilers, as though speaking in the name of the Apostles: "But, if we have omitted anything, experience will teach you, for we all have the Spirit of God."

II. *Christian Instruction.*

Catechetical instruction, as a general rule, was limited to three years; so that the Catechumen, after having completed the first year satisfactorily, might be admitted to hear the Word of God and the sermon; at the conclusion of which, after solemn prayer and the blessing, he was dismissed before the worship of the believers, the service of the general congregation, commenced. Nothing can be more natural; for the celebration of the Lord's Supper was the solemn act of the believers, and implied reception into the Christian community, of which it was intended to be the sacred symbol. I can no more understand, therefore, the objections raised by some Protestant scholars against this division of the service, than I can the mischievous notion, adopted by some Catholic or Catholicizing divines even at the present day, of a secret doctrine, an invention of their own, from which the Catechumens were to be excluded. The institution, on the contrary, arose out of the nature of the case, and was therefore suitable to the occasion. No one can take part in the solemn ceremony of a close society, except one who has been received into it. To have allowed it would have been a contradiction in terms.

The system of instruction was based upon the Law as much as upon Faith. It commenced with the Decalogue, as being the written moral law; but the Ten Commandments were not enjoined as an external law to be literally observed, with which the observance of the Sunday, which threw into the background that of the Sabbath, was incompatible. The obligation imposed was shown to be an internal one, in the spirit of Christ's com-

mandments, the love of God and of our neighbour. The Sermon on the Mount furnished a deeper insight into the moral law, and resolved all unlawfulness into offences against it, by substituting internal holiness for justification by works. Thus the believing heathen became reconciled with the Jewish system, as the Jew did with what must at first have repulsed him, as being a violation of the Law. Next came the initiation into the history of Revelation, from Adam, the father of mankind, the image of God, and Abraham, in whom all nations were blessed, down to Christ, whose life and death formed the centre of this hallowed history of the human race. The books of the Old Testament, and the canon of the New, which were gradually being closed, were placed before the Catechumen, together with useful Christian compositions. For, by degrees, a Christian literature was formed, the first specimens of which were regarded in the same light as the apocryphal books were by the later Jews. At that time, almost every inhabitant of the towns throughout the Roman empire, which were the cradles of the Christian Churches, knew how to read.

In the earliest Church, the office of teacher was open to all. Every one taught to whom the Spirit gave the vocation. By degrees the office of the Elders became an office of teachers, and that of the Deacons also. Our Text-book presents to us already distinct ecclesiastical offices; but still, according to them, laymen who were duly qualified, might also instruct the Catechumens; for the book states that the Scripture says, "They shall all be taught of God."

The Alexandrian text, in mentioning the Prayer for the Catechumens, and the imposition of hands which ensued, adds: "So let it be, therefore, whether he be an Ecclesiastic or Layman who offers the prayer."

III. *The Examination.*

In the third and last year of the preparation, the Catechumens were called *competentes*, or candidates, as in the second they had

been called hearers. Before they were set apart from the rest, in immediate preparation for baptism, an examination was made as to their life and conduct during the period of probation, the principal stress being laid upon whether they had honoured the widows, visited the sick, and performed other works of Christian charity. Those who had first introduced them to the community, were obliged to witness to these facts in the character of sponsors. It is unnecessary to say, that this examination was a public one. The congregation was, and continued to be, the supreme judge. Those who inhabited estates or villages which formed small congregations by themselves, under a single clergyman, may have gone through the preliminary steps at their homes; but the completion must have been left to the judgment of the mother Church after a sufficient examination.

IV. *The Baptismal Vow, and the immediate Preparation for it.*

If the candidates passed this ordeal, they were first bathed, and pronounced personally clean; they fasted on the Friday, and met together solemnly on the Saturday. Thereupon they were commanded to pray. They knelt down, and received the Bishop's blessing, who exorcised every unclean spirit, bidding him go out from them, and from that time forth never again to enter into the soul, which was to be dedicated to the Lord.

After the conclusion of this solemn ceremony of exorcisement from all evil and impurity, and liberation from the ancient curse and enmity with God, the Bishop breathed upon each of them, as the Lord had done upon His disciples, and then sealed them (as the Text-Book expresses it) on the foreheads, ears, and lips, doubtless with the sign of the cross. The whole night was passed in prayer and exhortation; each neophyte being allowed only to eat of the bread which he had brought with him as the thank-offering for the following Sunday, his contribution towards the general meal. At the dawn of Sunday, the baptismal font was filled, accompanied by a blessing, which

corresponds exactly with the prayers used in consecrating the elements intended for the Lord's Supper. The Deacons assisted the men, and the Deaconesses the women, to take off all their ornaments, and put on the baptismal dress. They were then presented to one of the Presbyters, who called solemnly on each of them to renounce Satan, and all his service, and all his works. In the Church of Jerusalem, doubtless in conformity with an ancient custom, the Catechumen turned himself towards the West, as the symbol of spiritual darkness, out of which he was to be brought into eternal light.

After this solemn renunciation he was anointed by the Presbyter with the oil of exorcism, an expression of the Alexandrian Church, the meaning of which is explained by the words used by the Elder upon this occasion: "Let every evil spirit depart from thee." It is expressly stated in other ordinances that he was anointed from head to foot, a completion, as it were, of the preparatory bath by which the body was purified; and this is indisputably the original signification. The Deacon and Deaconess accompanied the neophytes into the water, and made each of them in turn repeat after them a confession of faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or respond to it by the words "I believe." This Creed was much more simple in the Churches of the second and third centuries, than the formula which we use under the name of the Apostles' Creed, and evidently originated in the baptismal formula of St. Matthew's Gospel. In the Western Church the most simple Creed was that of Rome, the authentic form of which, in the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, is still extant. That of Alexandria, however, kept still closer to the Gospel form. The shape in which it appears in the present text of the Coptic Church-Book bears evident marks of a post-Nicene interpolation, as well as of some equally clumsy additions made at any earlier period. By tracing these additions, we easily perceive that the only portion of the Christian Creed which can be proved to have been universally recognised as such had a strictly objective sense, and was couched in terms agreeable to the language of Scripture. Not that the other parts of it were not true also; but they were not considered binding on the consciences of the whole Christian body, and

thus the unhallowed bondage of scholastic forms was avoided. The ambiguous and unscriptural expression, "Communion of Saints" (i. e. believers), for instance, is not found in any one of these confessions. This is shown more in detail in the first note to the preceding Part.

The necessity for establishing orthodox formulas as to the person of Jesus, in opposition to the false doctrines of the Gnostics and Ebionites, led in the Alexandrian ritual to a supplemental Creed, which corresponds with our present second article in the Apostles' Creed, inasmuch as they both contain a condensed summary of the Gospel narrative, with the addition of a few words about the Holy Ghost, the groundwork of our present third article. This supplemental formula is a direct external testimony that the proper baptismal confession itself did not contain these amplifications.

That Confession was three times repeated, being uttered before each of the three immersions, and generally addressed to the neophyte in the shape of a question, to be answered in the affirmative with the words "I believe." After that followed the true baptismal unction with the precious oil, the so-called Chrisma. According to the Alexandrian Constitution, the hand with the oil was laid on the head of the baptized, and then the forehead anointed with the sign of the cross, which in the strict sense is called the Sealing. The ordinances of this Church mention the Presbyters as executing all these functions as well as the Bishop, with the exception of the blessing of the oil. The ceremony concluded with the Christian kiss.

V. *The Admission.*

After this the persons baptized were clothed in white and conducted into the Church.

Unction represented, in the minds of the Church, the universal priesthood of Christians. In order to substantiate this, the person anointed had first of all to reply to the salu-

tation of the Bishop or Elder, "The Lord be with thee," in the words "And with thy spirit." The same ordinances enjoin that every neophyte should pray, and utter with his own lips the salutation of peace, in the precise words in which the Bishop addresses the congregation before the Lord's Supper, "Peace be with you." The Greek Constitutions express the exhibition of this universal priesthood not less significantly, by prescribing that the neophytes should turn to the East and repeat the Lord's Prayer aloud, "in the name of the whole congregation." After this they partook of the Lord's Supper, in which milk and honey were set before them, as well as the bread and wine, doubtless as symbols of their being, as it were, newly born.

Baptism is indeed called new-birth, "regeneration." But in what sense? Was it a sort of magical conversion of the curse into a blessing, effected now, in the case of the infant, by the act of sprinkling? Was it a forgiving of sins not intended to be brought back to the recollection of the parents or sponsors who were present, but to be applied to the infant itself?

The ancient Church knew no more than do the Gospels and the Apostles of such superstition, which contains less spirituality than many of the lustrations of the old world, and not much more than the *taurobolia* and *criobolia*, mysteries of the last stages of heathenism, purporting to purify the neophyte by the blood of victims. On the contrary, she bears authentic testimony, in all her ordinances, against this corruption and misunderstanding. As in other cases, the origin was innocent, and I think that we are at this moment better able than either the defenders or opponents of infant baptism have hitherto been, to explain how it originated. A passage in our Alexandrian Church-Book gives the true explanation of the assertion of Origen, himself an Alexandrian, that the baptism of children was an Apostolical tradition, and it removes the origin of infant baptism from Tertullian and Hippolytus to the end of our present period, Cyprian being the first Father who, impelled by a fanatical enthusiasm, and assisted by a bad interpretation of the Old Testament, established it as a principle.

Origen, in three passages (Note A. to this Part) of which the sense is in the main the same, says that the Levitical injunction of the sacrificial purification for the first-born infant seems to him a proof that impurity and sinfulness attach to man from his birth, and that for this reason the Church, according to Apostolical tradition, performs the act of baptism even upon children. He employs the same expression for children which Jesus used when the disciples endeavoured to prevent them from being brought unto Him: "Suffer the little children (parvuli) to come unto me;" a word which Irenæus uses in a remarkable passage (Hær. ii. 22.; quoted in our First Part), implying a difference between babes (infantes) and boys (pueri), obviously intending, therefore, to express what those words in the Gospel clearly mean, little growing children from about six to ten years old. Such, then, is also the true interpretation of this and of the other two passages in Origen, where the same word occurs. But a comparison with what appears from our Text-Book to have been considered Apostolical tradition before the time of Origen, shows that no other interpretation is admissible. The Text-Book speaks of those who go down with the other Catechumens into the baptismal bath, but are not yet in a state to make the proper responses; in that case the parents are bound to do it for them. This is undoubtedly the Apostolical practice to which Origen refers, for it was to the Church of Alexandria that he particularly belonged. In this ordinance the whole arrangement seems to be an exceptional one; and so it is in Origen, for he says the "little ones also." When the Church instituted pedobaptism (in the sense of children from six to ten years of age), she doubtless had before her eyes our Lord's affectionate words, referred to likewise by Origen on the occasion; and the divines of the sixteenth century soon found themselves obliged to revert to them. Tertullian rejects, in the following terms, such an interpretation of that expression, after having refuted the objections urged by some persons against the postponement of baptism, on the strength of the story of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip, and that of St. Paul (De Bapt. c. 18.):—"For it is desirable to postpone baptism according to the position and disposition of each individual, as well as in

reference to his age, but especially so in the case of children (parvuli). Where is the necessity for placing the sponsors in jeopardy, who may be prevented by death from performing their promises, or may be deceived by the breaking out of an evil disposition? It is true that our Lord said, 'Hinder them not from coming unto me;' but they may do so when they have arrived at the age of puberty, they may do so when they have begun to learn, and when they have learned to whom they are going. Why should they at that innocent age hasten to have their sins forgiven them? Ought we to act with less circumspection than in worldly matters, and allow those who are not intrusted with earthly property to be intrusted with heavenly? . . . Whoever attaches to baptism the importance it deserves, will be afraid rather of being too hasty than too procrastinating. True faith is sure of salvation." This is the way in which Tertullian treats the subject of baptism of the growing children. What would he have said to the application of Christ's words to the case of infants?

The difference, then, between the ante-Nicene and the later Church was essentially this: the later Church, with the exception of converts, only baptized new-born infants, and she did so on principle; the ancient Church, as a general rule, baptized adults, and only after they had gone through the course of instruction, and, as the exception only, Christian children who had not arrived at years of maturity, but never infants. Tertullian's opposition is to the baptism of young, growing children; he does not say one word about new-born infants. Neither does Origen, when his expressions are accurately weighed. Cyprian, and some other African bishops, his contemporaries, at the close of the third century, were the first who viewed baptism in the light of a washing away of the universal sinfulness of human nature, and connected this idea with that ordinance of the Old Testament, circumcision. If the sin to be washed away were not as much that actually committed as original hereditary sin, a new-born child might certainly as well be baptized as one growing up; or rather, it would be the most natural and the safest thing to do so. Indeed, Cyprian thought the second day safer than the eighth,

which some of his brethren proposed, as being analogous to the law respecting circumcision. Go but one step farther; establish a principle of aggression instead of defence, and baptism will be exclusively the water of regeneration, not for sins consciously committed before conversion, but for hereditary disposition to sin only, leaving penances and priestly absolutions to procure forgiveness for the sins after baptism and secure "baptismal regeneration."

There are two very different reasons why the Church has been dragged into this wrong path. The first is the deep feeling prevalent in the Apostolic communities, of the evil of sin, of the sinfulness of man, and of his need of salvation, and the faith in the salvation brought and announced by Christ. This salvation consisting in communion with Christ, consequently with the congregation of the believers, any one who happened to be prevented by sickness or death from living in this communion, wished naturally to die in it. The only explanations of St. Paul's expression (1 Cor. xv. 29.) which can be maintained on philological and historical grounds, "Why are they then baptized for the dead?" implies the existence of a custom, the practice of which is not disapproved by the Apostle in that passage, but which subsequently is only found among the Cerinthians, Marcionites, and other sects. A brother or a Catechumen who could prove that a deceased Christian friend had a believing disposition, and a desire to be admitted into the Church, received baptism in his stead; that is to say, he made, in the presence of the congregation, the confession of faith, and took the baptismal vow for him. This evidence being given, such a one was considered as a brother, and as having "departed in peace," and was so mentioned in the prayers of the Church. This is, in truth, nothing else but testimony to a fact, a well-grounded evidence of a departed brother having held the Christian faith during his lifetime. It is a form of the recognition of the "Baptism of Tears or Longing," which, like the "Baptism of Blood," was held equivalent to regular baptism. But certainly that form also betrays something of the superstitious fear of demons (*δεισιδαιμονία*) of the Jewish-heathen world, and this very absorbing dread of demoniacal influence must be considered

as the second cause of the deviation from Apostolical doctrine and practice. That demonism has its deepest root in the moral hopelessness of the age, the despair of mankind as to itself and as to God, and, on the part of Christians, to the existing order of the world. It is unphilosophical and unhistorical, in tracing the development of Church doctrine, to overlook the prevalence of that feeling of decay and death which pervaded those ages. Doctrine as well as practice took a pathological development, because the age was both a despairing and a desperate one. There is no other way of explaining the infatuation of supposing that the sentence of condemnation, which Scripture and conscience proclaim against ungodly selfish nature striving in man for the mastery, could apply to the case of infants, in whose conscience the consciousness of God is as much implanted as is the God-forgetting love of self. It is as though the fear of those demons, which the Church endeavoured to expel, as being the masters of the "old man," had again entered into the African divines. They made out of the extreme exception the unexceptionable rule, and hallowed as a Church doctrine, on which the salvation of the soul depended, what they must have despaired of justifying either by reason or by the ancient Church practices. Thus the Christian conscience became gradually bewildered. The paternal face of God, who hates iniquity, but loves His own creation and image, was transformed into the caricature of a bloodthirsty Moloch, and the way was paved for spiritual despotism.

It is the tame copy of this caricature which still prevents the eternal love of God being felt as it ought in the Church of the free Gospel, and stifles that consciousness of the evil and misery of real sin, which was the truest element in the religious feeling of the ancient Church. This is the consequence of the admission of an untruth. When the Church attached rights and promises of blessing to any thing except to the conscious abandonment of sin, and to the voluntary vow of dedicating life and soul to the Lord, as Justin the Martyr as well as St. Peter defines it, the consciousness of sin and the longing for real truthful reformation died away in the same proportion among her members.

II.

THE CHURCHES OF THE PRESENT DAY REFLECTED IN THIS PICTURE.

When we look upon the picture thus presented to us of the general consciousness of the ancient Church, as exhibited at the beginning of the third century, we at once remark in it some dark spots which, upon closer observation, do not become transparent. Who can identify himself with the demonism which, like an incubus, presses upon the religious consciousness of that age? Who with that striving after forms which tends to give to externals the appearance of objective reality, and thus throws into the background the true objective, the Divine essence, as well as its only true reflex, the human mind? Every retrograde step in spiritual religion is based on one of these two errors: heathen demonism, which binds the free spirit under the yoke of necessity, the powers of nature, and thus destroys the subjective element of religion; and Jewish formalism, which places the objective in externals, and thereby loses sight of God, the real objective, and of the God-seeking spirit. It cannot be denied that the germ of both these unhealthy tendencies, formalism and demon-fear (the *δεισιδαιμονία* of Greek writers), began to show itself already in the ancient Church. And who does not at once perceive in the background the dark clouds of hierarchism, which endeavours to obtain dominion over conscience, in order to gain the mastery over the mind, and to substitute for the "Prince of this world" the Priest of this world? But these sombre clouds only serve to make the light of the foreground more vivid, and these dark spots become dissolved, in the telescope of historical contemplation, into undeveloped or veiled light. Substitute for demons, the formula: "the powers of nature," place conscious selfishness as its exponent in man, and prefix to the whole the *minus* sign in order

to indicate that this selfishness is the negation of real existence. In doing so, you express that same philosophical truth mathematically, which those men saw before their mind's eye in the nebulous, but then impressive, forms of the mythological process. Do not, therefore, despise such mythological expressions: rather see whether they are not the historically necessary form of an eternal truth, which it is better to express imperfectly than to ignore or deny. If ever you succeed in discovering the Keplerian laws of the progress of mind through time, those nebulæ will have the same place in your system, which the mythology of the Greeks occupies in the history of their philosophy, that of a preformation. You will not covet, then, those forms which were not made for you nor for your nation, and which the ancient Church invented with the same freedom with which you may reject them. But you will understand them for the first time, as being a part of universal history. Admit them then without hesitation, without any fear of thereby forfeiting your holy zeal for truth, if in your time, and among your co-religionists, the type should establish itself in place of the idea, and the symbol usurp the throne of God in the conscience. But, above all, cast a glance upon yourself, and upon your own times, and remark how, in the stead of that old formalism which has created beautiful forms, a lamentable absence of form, a negative formalism, has crept in. You will then become aware, that, in the stead of demonism, a sentimentality has established itself, which draws down the mind to the passivity of personal sensation, just as demonism degrades it to the state of hypostatized unconscious nature.

But if you look a little closer into the ecclesiastical condition of the two ages, are you not overpowered by one predominant feeling? And is this not the feeling, that in the one age we find, upon the whole, connexion, reality, internal and external truth; in the other, little else but patchwork and ruins, shams and phantoms? That in one case a real life was lived, a life of freedom, as to the Church and as to the individual; that in the other, conventionalism is fostered, or rather in most instances maintained by fire and sword, by the tyranny of State Churches, or by the unthinking superstition of habit? and that such a state

of things is most ill-advisedly vaunted as possessing vitality, or even most impudently proclaims itself perfect and infallible?

The ancient baptism comprised, on Gospel grounds, four spiritual elements — instruction, examination, the vow, the initiation. To each of these elements was attached a sacred symbol, an externally working act of the Church, who, by means of her Bishops and Elders, ordained in the place of God. To instruction, the blessing corresponded; to examination, the imposition of hands; to confession, immersion in water; to the vow for life and for death, the unction as Priest and King. Thus did the beggar enter into the communion of the faithful; thus the emperor, when he ventured to do so. Constantine considered of it until his death-bed.

It is impossible but that this ceremony should have produced a great general impression, which was not diminished if the Initiated were the child of Christian parents. The act was his own, as much as it was in the case of a convert from heathenism. The very gradual advancement even of the age of baptism in the case of children of Christian families, must have been injurious to its character as a solemnity. We have already seen how, even before the close of our period, the baptism of new-born infants grew out of that of children advancing towards the age of boyhood. We have seen how, from the baptism of the Spirit, which Christ instituted, people relapsed into ceremonial law, and fell back upon the shadow of a Jewish custom, which had ceased to be binding with the extinction of the nation, and now was made a sanction for the religion of the new Covenant of Humanity.

In consequence of this alteration and complete subversion of its main features, brought about principally by the Africans of the third century, and completed by Augustin, these natural elements have been, in the course of nearly fifteen centuries, most tragically decomposed, and nothing is now remaining anywhere but ruins. In the East people adhered to immersion, although this symbol of Man voluntarily and consciously making a vow of the sacrifice of self, lost all meaning in the immersion of a new-born child. The Eastern Church, moreover, practised the unction immediately after the immersion, although

that unction implies, even more than immersion, Man's full consciousness, and is to be the seal of a free pledge, of a responsible act. Yet the Eastern Church requires, nevertheless, the general recognition of both, as necessary to salvation, and denies there is any efficacy in the Western form of baptism.

The Western Church evidently commenced her career, under the guidance of Rome, with more freedom of thought. She abolished, together with adult baptism, its symbol, immersion, and introduced sprinkling in its stead. She retained, again, unction, the chrisma, by way of confirmation, and separated the two acts; so that, at all events, a beginning of consciousness and instruction may be assumed to be implied as a justification of the subsequent ceremony. Yet with this she rigidly maintained in her teaching, as to the effect of the act of baptism, all the consequences which the Gospel and the ancient Church so undeniably and authentically connect with the previous instruction, and the voluntary conscious vow. The doctrine of Augustin was completed and stereotyped by Thomas Aquinas. The practice of the Latin Church has equally little correspondence with the custom and spirit of the ancient, as regards unction. The postponement of this solemnity is a recognition of the principle; but even the legal age of seven is much too early a period to show that the ceremony is not to be an *opus operatum*, but the voluntary act of the conscious mind. And still the practice prevailing in exclusively Catholic countries, of bringing children of four and five years old to the Bishop to be confirmed, proves how little the proper idea to be conveyed by the act is seriously attended to; and more strongly still, how little impression it has made on the popular mind. Whatever improvement has been effected in this practice in France, and to a still greater extent in Catholic Germany, by way of preparation for the first Communion (the admission to which, according to the idea of the ancient Church, is expressed directly by the unction), is due, as history attests, to the influence of the Reformation on the formation of popular customs.

But, what did the Reformation itself? The Reformers retained the doctrine of Augustin, together with pedobaptism.

It is true, nevertheless, that they regarded the baptism of new-born infants merely as an offering, a dedication of the children by their parents, as a vicarious act, and as the first step only in a process which was actually to be completed by themselves in riper years, after their Christian education was finished, through their own voluntary confession and vow. We are indebted to Luther especially for this correct conception, and the having worthily and rationally carried it out is the most blessed work of the Evangelical Church of the German nation. Confirmation is, at the present moment, together with the principle of intellectual liberty, the Bible and the hymns, the principal means of keeping alive German Protestantism. But, at the same time, the doctrine of the Sacraments did not admit confirmation as one of them. Consequently, it was not held to be necessary to salvation, because not prescribed by the Gospel, which, however, is equally silent upon the subject of the sprinkling of children. Thus the essential points in the Gospel and in the practice of the Apostles, faith and self-sacrifice, have been placed lower in the scale than the sprinkling, which was adopted instead of the Jewish immersion, and the personal act has been held in less estimation than its substitute. This may be compatible with the Romish doctrine of good works, but is as repugnant to the evangelical doctrine of justification by faith, as it is to the precepts of the Gospel, and the practice of the Apostles. The leathern scholasticism of the seventeenth century, it is true, knew how to justify all that; but, of this justification, neither Scripture rightly interpreted, nor reason speaking its own language, can take cognizance.

The Protestant Church in Germany fell besides into another contradiction, inasmuch as she defended and admitted the validity of confirmation, as being the voluntary act of the individual, and yet supported, with all her power, the interference of the State, by whose regulations no person can be admitted into any trade or service, unless he can produce a certificate of confirmation.

The Reformed Church, which had no scruple in swallowing the camel of pedobaptism, as being in harmony with Scripture, found no place in its theological conscience for confirmation,

because it was not prescribed in Scripture, was a human invention. In the course of two centuries, wherever the two Evangelical Confessions coexist, custom has corrected that untenable theological one-sidedness, by the introduction of the Lutheran confirmation, and this has been one of the many inward preparations to the union of the two Confessions.

The English Church, in her Articles, adopts the general Evangelical doctrine of baptism in such a way as to place human faith by the side of Divine grace (Art. 27. compared with Art. 11.). She reconciles, moreover, the scholastic doctrine which limits the efficacy of baptism to original sin, and excludes from it all deadly sins committed after baptism, as well as the fanatical view that persons once baptized can sin no more (Art. 16.). But in her Liturgy, exclusively and rigorously prescribed since the end of the seventeenth century, she certainly uses expressions which appear better suited to the Romish than the Evangelical doctrine, and which have consequently become a snare to many consciences, and a cause of constantly continuing separation from the Church. Lastly, confirmation has been no farther advanced, either doctrinally or practically, beyond the point at which it was left at the time of the separation from the Church of Rome. The English Church, therefore, is not only in this particular essentially unreformed, but considerably behind the French, and especially behind the Roman Catholic Church in Germany. Episcopal confirmation, notwithstanding the zealous efforts of the prelates of the day, remains, as to its essence and efficacy, an *opus operatum*. How this has reacted on infant baptism is clear from the fact, that, among the lower classes of the population of London, so many of those who belong to the Establishment are either not baptized at all, or never set their foot inside the Church again after baptism. This also accounts for so many of its members never having been confirmed.

It is unnecessary here to repeat how little foundation there is in the ancient Church for the exclusive right of the Bishop to confirm, which is the main hindrance to a radical reform. It must not, however, be forgotten that it dates from a period in which every town, however small, was a bishopric.

Still less is it to be wondered at, that such a Church has given birth to the sects of Quakers and Baptists. The former of these consider external baptism as a Jewish custom, to be no longer binding after the downfall of the Jewish people; and the abuse to which it had led dangerous, if not fatal. The Baptists have restored adult baptism. But, as in the first case the negation of the form has grown into a formality; so, in the latter, has the restoration of an old form. The Baptists find it difficult to understand that the idea of the German Protestant act of baptism, which concludes with the vow and benediction, corresponds exactly with the idea of the Gospel commandment, the letter of which they push to such an extent; and, under the yoke of an utterly one-sided rigid Calvinism, they are inclined to attach to their own form a superstitious power, by which the efficacy of a continually renewed faith is thrown into the background.

But how little the Churches of the seventeenth century can make head against the onsets of the Baptists, in countries where a great and free religious movement exists, is evinced by the fact, that, among serious Christians of the English race in the United States, the Baptists or Congregational preachers are on the increase more than any other sect, so that they form already the most numerous and most progressive community.

How much mischief and injury are inflicted on the life of the Church in general by this and similar separations, will appear upon a comparison of the parish schools of the English Congregations and those of the Apostolical Church. In the ancient Church every thing is based upon congregational life and instruction. In England, many of the noblest elements are withdrawn from the National Church, and the seceding congregations languish in consequence of isolation, and suffer still more by the pride of being the Elect. The former has never established parish schools as a national institution, the latter have never striven after national life.

Neither as regards German and Continental parish schools in general, is a glance at that picture calculated to flatter our pride. The palsy of the life of the Church, and the decay of the spirit of a free Christian community, are but too manifestly exhibited by the prevalence of police regulations.

III.

THE MORAL APPLICATION TO THE CHURCH OF THE FUTURE.

This is the picture, and this is the mirror. If the former be true and the latter faithful, it is high time to proceed to the work of restoration. As we have met everywhere with traces of death and of decay, so we have discovered on the other hand that the germs and scions of future life have not altogether become extinct. Who desires to establish what is dead? Who can wish to eradicate the germs of life? Who can revivify the former, however desirable it may be thought? Who can prevent the latter from increasing, however dangerous such a growth may be to the existing order of things?

Upon closer and deeper reflection, it will appear wise to retain pedobaptism, but to remodel the whole baptismal discipline on the following principles.

1. To this end, in the first place, the doctrine of biblical baptism must be reformed in the sense of the German Church, and of the doctrinal works of Schleiermacher, Neander, Nitzsch, and the German school in general. According to this view, our act of baptism forms a whole, the commencement of which is the sprinkling of the child, the conclusion the pledge of the grown up and instructed young Christian, sealed by a blessing.

2. In the second place, the superstition that such children of Christian parents, as die of tender age unbaptized, are under damnation, from which they must be rescued by baptism, is to be put down for ever by bringing forward its true corrective.

3. This can only be done by positively and practically realizing the idea, that the baptism of new-born children is the outward sign of the vow of the parents to dedicate their child to God, as His gift intrusted to them, and to prepare it by a Christian education for becoming a member of the Christian

Church until it be itself able to profess the faith in Christ, and to make the vow of a godly life dedicated to God and the brethren.

4. Further, at the performance of the ceremony, the duty imposed upon parents and sponsors, as sureties for the Christian education of the child at home and at school, must be brought more prominently forward; while, on the other hand, every expression must be omitted or modified which is only appropriate to cases where the person to be baptized takes the pledge himself, and which never ought to have been transferred from the ceremony of adult to that of infant baptism.

5. The act of baptism must again become a congregational and Church festival, which cannot surely be effected solely by the circumstance of the ceremony being performed in the church.

6. The taking children to school and to church must be treated as an act of the life of the whole community, as it was in the Apostolical Church.

7. The confirmation must be performed with all the seriousness and solemnity which are usual in the German Evangelical Church.

On these fundamental assumptions the following principal heads of practical reform might be proposed for the present National Church communities whenever they resolve to enter upon a thorough reformation.

1. As in the ancient Church, baptismal festivals should be instituted. The ancient Church selected for this purpose Easter and Whitsuntide; to which, here and there, the festival of the Epiphany was added as representing the baptism of Christ. The most natural arrangement would be, the institution of FOUR BAPTISMAL FESTIVALS, three of them at the Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide holidays, the fourth on a Sunday in the autumn, or on the first Sunday in Advent, as being the beginning of the ecclesiastical year. In proposing such an arrangement it is supposed that on each of these days all children who have been born in the intermediate time will be baptized. The THANKSGIVING OF MOTHERS would most naturally

form a part of such a congregational festival, and constitute a visible bond of sisterhood amongst the mothers, whatever might be their rank.

2. On each of these festivals the candidates for baptism, with their parents and sponsors, should be considered as a BAPTISMAL CONGREGATION, and the ceremony as a common one, and as a portion of the Church service of the congregation.

3. The same days should also be the FESTIVALS of INTRODUCTION of baptized children who have attained their seventh year, the time at which they generally enter the boys' and girls' school. The children of both sexes should, if possible, be introduced by their parents and sponsors as a SCHOOL CONGREGATION, to be admitted with prayer and blessing, and an exhortation setting forth that the object of the instruction they are now about to receive is to prepare them for confirmation.

4. Instead of either excluding altogether from Sunday service the children who are thus introduced into the Church (the school children who are passing from the stage of infancy to that of puberty), or disgusting them with it by making them listen to sermons they cannot understand, and which are in some respects totally unfitted for them, a SCHOOL SERVICE should be established for the younger ones, which, being short and congenial to their feelings, might make an impression and be beneficial to them.

5. CONFIRMATION should be conducted essentially according to the custom and the Liturgical formularies of the German Lutheran Church, which cannot be surpassed in dignity and solemnity. In a note (B.) to this Part, one of these composed from the ancient formularies is appended, to which is added that agreed upon for the confirmation of German Catechumens at Jerusalem. As to the age for confirmation, the fourteenth birthday should be considered as the earliest: the custom of the Reformed Church, not to allow young persons to be prepared for the first communion before eighteen, is, on the whole, the safer one.

How far, and in what way, the episcopal element may be brought into prominence in this arrangement, will depend upon

the constitution of each particular Church: it is clear, however, that this idea may be also realized by a collegiate cooperation of ministers placed upon an equal footing.

There are, however, two conditions indispensable to all such reforms. The first is the cessation of all religious persecution and all State-Church compulsion, and the recognition of the congregation of communicants as the organ of the Spirit in the Church. The second is the abolition of exclusion from a Church on account of difference in forms. I do not see for what good internal reason the Baptists, as such, can be excluded from a National Church. Those who give a preference to adult baptism (and the number of such persons, under a reformed system, would be very small, at least where the German language is spoken) should no more be looked upon as heretics on that account, than Baptists, on their part, should stigmatize by that name such congregations as have a preference for infant-baptism. As to the Society of Friends, it certainly can only be said by ignorant people that they reject baptism altogether: for they most stringently insist upon spiritual baptism in the sense of the Gospel, the being immersed and buried with Christ. The misunderstanding which is the origin of their discontinuance of baptism has arisen, according to the law of reaction, from the prevalence of a materialistic view of baptism in the National Church out of which that Society took its origin. That misunderstanding can only be removed by bringing out in all its force the spirit of the original institution.

BOOK II.

THE CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

I.

THE PICTURE.

HERE I shall be able to be more brief than I was in the First Book, respecting the sense of the Ordinances. The genuine and ancient customs and ordinances, which are collected in the Church- and House-Book of the Apostolical Church, as well as in the Christian code, fully explain themselves, and their difference from the canonical law of the more modern hierarchy requires no comment. Nor have I much to say in detail respecting the practical application of the picture to our own times. My views on this subject are fully expressed in two previous works. I may, therefore, venture to confine myself here to general outlines from the point of view of Universal History.

The constitution of the Christian Church, like the political constitution of the Germanic races, rested upon the idea of a community freely submitting to a divine order of society which calls mankind to freedom, and makes man free. Christianity was a free, and in a certain sense, a secret, association. Already Moses had based his reform upon such an association. At a time when Egypt was suffering under the most iron despotism, and when the Aramaic races of Asia were in a state of the most revolting religious and moral debasement, he formed a free people, and a people of God, by organising it first as a secret religious community. It was by this agency that he threw off

the bondage of an empire mighty both in Africa and Asia, and united the tribes of Israel, who were dissevered and trodden under foot, into a nation of universal historical importance. Jesus and his disciples formed a secret society first out of the children of that nation, at the last turning point of its history, when subjected to the most cruel despotism of republican emperors, and amid the despair of a highly civilized but dissolute world. This society was based upon the freedom of its members from the Levitical law, on their equality as children of God, on their brotherhood as men. It was this society, established upon this freedom, this equality, and this fraternity, which dissolved the greatest empire in the world, and led to the formation of a vast association, embracing the whole human family throughout the world-wide dominions of Rome. After this association had, in the course of ages, formed Christian nations and states, and by their means remodelled Europe and the world, it fell into internal confusion, and became either petrified or decayed. All the movements of the last three hundred years tend towards a fearful dilemma: either a serious, judicious, conscious reform must be made in the Christian community of Western Europe, or the dissolution of the fundamental elements of society will be effected by social revolutions. There are countries, even now, where Socialism is the only sign of constitutional and religious life in the consciousness of the people. Socialism, however, is nothing but the demoniacal caricature of the original Christian Association, reflected by the concave mirror of hatred against the selfishness, luxury, and Mammon-worship of the higher classes. Christianity saved the old world from this misfortune, by bringing the Elect, through faith in God and in man, into a new world; but the passage lay over the ruins of existing states and civilization. The ancient world perished by the birth-throes of Christianity: ours, if not reformed, will perish by convulsions attending its decay. There is no other real sign given to our generation but this. The consideration of the picture of the religious and moral conditions which the constitution of the earliest Christian communities offers is on that account no idle question, but one of immediate interest and vital importance to the present age.

Every town-congregation of ancient Christianity, the constitution of which we have to delineate, was a Church. The constitution of that Church was a congregational constitution. In St. Paul's Epistles, in the writings of Clemens Romanus, of Ignatius, and of Polycarp, the congregation is the highest organ of the spirit as well as power of the Church. It is the body of Christ, the embodiment of the person of Jesus of Nazareth in the society which was founded by Him, and through faith in Him. This congregation was governed and directed by a Council of Elders, which congregational council, at a later period, was presided over, in most Churches, by a governing overseer, the Bishop. But the ultimate decision, in important emergencies, rested with the whole congregation. The bishop and elders were its superintending members; its guides, but not its masters.

In most of the customs and ordinances transmitted to us, we find this active interference on the part of the congregation considerably weakened. Already a hierarchy has been established. Nevertheless the congregation elects its Bishop, and invites the bishops of the neighbouring localities to institute him into his office with prayer and the imposition of hands. If the congregation is still to be formed, the bishop names the Elders, three at least, and inducts them with prayer and a benediction. They form with him the Congregational Council. The bishop elects at least one Deacon, as his assistant; and appoints widows and young women to take care, both spiritually and bodily, of the orphans, the sick, and the poor. If the bishopric of a congregation, already formed, become vacant, the form of episcopal election remains the same: the clergy elect with the people; there is no form of election prescribed, consequently none is excluded. If the office of Presbyter is vacant, sometimes the bishop and clergy, sometimes the whole congregation, fill it up. The bishop consecrates the presbyters, as he is himself consecrated by his brother bishops. Their ordination (dedication to God by prayer, with imposition of hands) is the same: only that the elders have no throne, or raised chair, in the apse at the end of the church, but sit upon benches on both sides. Between the clergy and the congrega-

tion stands the communion-table, their bond of union and connecting link.

The hypothesis, therefore, of the Presbyterian Divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that the Bishop, as the first of his peers (*primus inter pares*), sprang from the elders of the congregation, falls to the ground as unhistorical. But their idea of Elders, as both an officiating and ruling body, is quite correct. The ancient Church knows no more of a single Presbyter than of clerical government and election. It was only in very small places, manors (*villæ*), that the collegiate form was not adopted. There, a single clergyman, who, according to the use of the word Bishop in the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul, was called a Country Bishop (chorepiscopus, i. e. country curate), managed the small community in its ordinary emergencies. His powers were limited, because he had not the assistance of a Church council.

The Lutheran view, again, especially that of the German Lutherans, according to which the clergy formed the order of teachers in the ancient Church, is entirely erroneous. The Church was a government, and the Bishop and Elders were magistrates; they directed the congregation, but without legislative power. Teaching and praying were open to every one in the Church of the Apostles; every man acting as a priest and anointed of the Lord. According to our ordinances the laity may still teach the Catechumens, dismiss them even with the blessing from the public service; for all (it is said) have the spirit of the Lord. The first act of the newly baptized, on entering into the congregation, is to give, or respond to, the episcopal greeting of Peace, or the benediction.

The nature of things, however, led, as early as the second century, to collective congregations. The small village communities in the vicinity of the town, already, to a certain extent, formed such an association with those of the city. This, however, was only the first, and an imperfect arrangement; because the integral parts, with the exception of the town, had no complete organization. The principal towns in the then existing provinces of the empire (and all the Apostolic Epistles are addressed to these) formed central points for the province or

island, as mother towns or metropolises. The bishops assembled there in synod. Believers had the liberty of attending their sittings and hearing the discussions. The first bishop, in age or importance, presided.

As to Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, however, the bishops had in early times incorporated with them a more considerable portion of the province. To Alexandria, the whole of Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis were united. We have, therefore, three different groups of Church jurisdiction: the town and adjacent villages; the principal and inferior towns of the island or province; and the great metropolis, with the entire province in the widest sense. Already, in the most restricted of these spheres, each individual portion was a complete Church in itself. Thus, we find the suburban towns incorporated with Rome; Tusculum and Præneste, Tibur and Velitræ, Ostia and Portus, each of them a bishopric. It is clear from the words of Hippolytus that there was no further extension of the Roman Church in his time. He makes no allusion whatever to the jurisdiction of Rome over the Suburbicarian provinces placed under the *Vicarius urbis;* that is, all the South of Italy and the Islands, and Central Italy as far as the Apennines, inclusive of Umbria and Tuscany. This stage of the development, therefore, belongs only to the end of our period, the close of the third and beginning of the fourth century. The Roman Church at the beginning of the third century had not yet become the Italian (in our sense), still less the Latin Church.

Now the circumstance in this ecclesiastical organization, which is of general historical interest, is this. The congregational element, which had united towns and villages, and had once formed the connecting link between the Churches of Jerusalem and of Antioch, did not extend to these wider relations. Rome and the adjacent towns were connected together, not by their congregations, nor even by their Church councils, but simply and solely by their bishops. In order to provide for their common wants, the bishops of these towns entered into the Council of the metropolitan congregation, which, in this way, exercised a certain jurisdiction over the other portions of the collective congregation. In this sense, and this only, can the

thirty-fifth Apostolical Canon be understood. It is the germ of that subsequent metropolitan system, which is exhibited in the decrees of Nicæa (325) and of Antioch (341) in a more developed shape. The "nations" which assemble round their "first" bishop, and act in common with him, are precisely the districts of the Hellenic and Roman world which form a nation in the antique sense, together with their chief town (like Corinth, Ephesus, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome). I have discussed at length, in my "Ignatian Letters," what was the peculiar development of this germ in the second century in Egypt. The Egyptian collection of Apostolic Ordinances, which has come to light since that publication, furnishes direct proof, that the consecration of the bishop of Alexandria by the clergy of his Church was a unique instance of that kind in Egypt; and that the metropolitan position of that capital did not in the least degree stand in the way of the independent episcopal organization of each individual town-congregation.

The Churches which grouped themselves round a great Church, stood in an organic, but strictly hierarchical connexion with it. It was natural that common interests should be treated of in common, and decided upon under the presidency of the bishop of the metropolis. The other bishops were joint elders in this council. They formed, with the parish clergy of the capital, the presbytery of the chief bishop. This is the origin of the College of Cardinals.

This second stage in the development of the Church's constitution is, therefore, already infected with the decay of the times. There were no longer then any real nations, but only municipal unions. The ancient world did not know a free nation beyond the municipal limits, and therefore had no representative government. Christianity prepared this by clerical senates and synods: it could not create nations. The congregation was free, and her life the only living and free life of the age. But this free element in the Christian community remains within the narrow limits of the municipal constitution; all beyond that is unfree, as regards the congregations. Independent and autonomic in their parochial concerns, the congregations are excluded from the general Church affairs.

But it is these precisely which became every day of more and more importance. In proportion as the relations grew more complicated, and the differences upon points of doctrine more serious, and in proportion as more stress was laid upon doctrinal forms, as symbols of the Church and conditions of Church communion, its government and destinies fell, more and more, into the hands of the bishop.

The connexion between the Church and the State was a purely negative one, and thereby necessarily hostile. The individual Church, whether in Rome or Jerusalem, Alexandria or Antioch, enjoyed a limited right of protection, as the Jews do at the present day in Rome. This was associated with harsh treatment of every description, and became, from time to time, not merely a grievous oppression, but cruel and bloody persecution; as in the case of the Jews in the middle ages. Christianity enjoined respect towards the ruling powers, as the administrators of the Divine order, and love towards them as well as towards all other enemies, but expressly also as such. For the same Christianity considered all the earthly empires of the day as instruments of the Prince of Darkness, ordained by God for punishment; and, at the very head of the Christian view of the world stood the belief that all these must perish, in order that the kingdom of God, the final object of the "good tidings" to enslaved humanity, might appear. The hatred of the Jews, as the people of God, towards all their oppressors, passed on to all Christians, strengthened by the power of love towards the brethren of the free society of the children of God. They prayed for princes and for emperors, but their warmest prayer, their most fervent supplication, "Thy kingdom come," was for the speedy dissolution of this world of evil, with Satan and all his tormentors. In order fully to estimate the force of this feeling, we must realize to our minds the fact that the community of the Roman empire, and its right of citizenship, even before the time of Hippolytus, wonderfully favoured the idea of the Catholic (universal) Church. This idea was based on the original fundamental view of Christianity, but the Christians could not become fully conscious of it until the total destructio of Jerusalem under Hadrian. This momentous moral event

brought the kingdom of God face to face with the kingdom of this world: the Universal Church did not even recognize the limits of the kingdom of this world as its own. Now this kingdom of God had no people beyond the municipal sphere; just as the kingdom of this world, beyond that sphere, had no nations. There only remained administrative districts, which were termed Provinces, with the addition, after the time of Constantine, of the combination into Dioceses (in the political sense) and Prefectures.

The old world was doomed to fall into decay, and to do so by means of the dissolving agency of Christianity. Christianity was to prepare the way for a new world, but, in its then organization, it must necessarily suffer from the calamity of the age, the want of national life. Instead of the defunct municipalities whose burdensome offices were avoided, as they now are in many parts of the Continent, it established in the towns Church authorities, animated with the internal life of a free people (populus means congregation), whereas the municipal corporations were bodies of police functionaries, almost as much as in modern France. It extended the free union to the neighbouring country population, and even to the country towns which were adjacent to a capital. But here, already, the congregational element remained unrepresented, and thus a national Church-union could no more be formed than a political nation. There existed, at that time, only the life of the corporations; and, beyond that, Christianity could not advance in its reorganizing social process. To represent this impossibility as the final aim, the standard for all ages, is almost as rational as the jesuitical theory of Ludwig Von Haller, according to which monarchy does not allow of a State society, nor of a State law, the State itself being nothing but a conglomeration of private rights, of corporations and personalities, grouping themselves round a factitious personality, reigning by the grace of God (represented by the Pope).

Although there existed a clerical hierarchy in the congregation, a person might become an elder without having been a deacon, a bishop without having been consecrated as elder. All the clergy, besides, might marry like other Christians; only on

the election of a bishop or elder, proof was required that he had been but once married; a second marriage being considered contrary to the injunction of the Apostle in the First Epistle to Timothy (iii. 2.).

From this objection to a second marriage, which, perhaps, originated in a misunderstanding, a rule was gradually formed which Hippolytus held to be a law of the Church, in opposition to the Romish bishop Callistus: that every one who was unmarried at the time of his entry into the clerical office (i. e. becoming bishop, elder, or even deacon) was precluded from marrying so long as he retained his office. The authentic history of this gradual alteration is clear from the interpolations which were made, on this point, in the most ancient collections of the Christian Canons, as fully appears from the table prefixed to our text of the same. The key to it, however, is to be looked for nowhere else than in the want of organic development of the congregational life, and in the exclusive claims of the clergy, which thereby became more and more established. Both again were intrinsically due to the wretchedness of the age, to the decline of all social life in the Hellenic and Roman world, and to the transformation of a commonwealth into the all-destroying and overwhelming military despotism of the emperors.

The stagnation of congregational life exhibits itself also but too clearly in the gradual displacement of the fundamental notions about Christian offices. As the bishop was the exclusive director in all matters not congregational but ecclesiastical, so were the elders in the congregational. Still the principle of collegiate power and action was retained, as well as that of the independence of the smaller in the collective congregations.

The most valuable portion, moreover, of the action of the congregations was preserved, namely, that of the services of charity. The office of Deacon or helper implies, in the full sense of the word, the attendance on the poor and the sick. To offer spiritual as well as bodily aid, and, indeed, to supply all common wants, was the individual duty of every Christian; and this divine idea of services of charity had so deeply pervaded the mind of the Church, that the office of deacon and deaconess grew out of it. The latter were ordinarily widows, and the

sisterhood of Widows is nothing more than that of Deaconesses. The recently recovered Coptic collection of Apostolical Church Ordinances furnishes most precious and original information upon this point also. The deacons had the charge of the poor, the deaconesses of the sick, and they attended indiscriminately upon those who stood in need of their consolation and assistance. A significant Egyptian legend attributes to Christ a speech addressed by Him to Mary and Martha, in a sense which, at all events, is deeply Christian and strictly Apostolical (1 Pet. iii. 7.), namely, that, in the Christian community, woman's weaker nature, when strengthened and elevated by the respect and honour of the man, developes a new and peculiar power, namely, that of serving and suffering Love.

The opulent provided for their poor; to which purpose the gifts offered at the common table, which became an altar as the symbol of a vow of self-dedication, were especially applied. It was a part of the system of community of goods among the early Christians, which had remained as a sacred custom. The first fruits of corn and wine, and whatever was titheable of the produce of the earth, served for the maintenance of the clergy. In all our Collections, the validity of the Apostolic injunction on that head is recognized; and especially the one, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn." In the re-written text of the first Greek Collection also, this precept is applied as signifying, that as the oxen by that means do not eat up all the corn on the threshing-floor, so the clergy should only appropriate to themselves a very small portion of the gifts of the congregation, or Church property.

II.

THE REFLEX.

HERE, again, no existing Church community comes up to that which is exhibited in the early Christian Churches, as the substance and aim of the idea of Christ and his Apostles. But in each of them remains and fragments are extant, conscious or unconscious, intentional or accidental reminiscences; in many of them even the germs of future life. And, besides, these fifteen centuries have had to struggle with an entirely new problem: the relation of the Church to a Christian State. This is the Gordian knot of modern Europe, easy to be cut, but impossible to be loosed except by Christian liberty being made the law of the land in Church and State.

The Greek Church, that is to say, the Church of Byzantium, which, after having oppressed all the national Churches in Syria, Egypt, and Assyria, rules over the ruins of the Byzantine empire and the vast and aspiring empire of Russia, hitherto only offers the stereotyped form of a system of discipline and of metropolitan government. The rigid Church discipline, with its penances and penalties, arose out of the spiritual superintendence of each brother by the congregation: in like manner, the right of permanent or temporary exclusion, which we find in the Byzantine metropolitan system, was developed out of the power which the congregational unions of the ante-Nicene period possessed. The priests were the heirs of the congregation.

As in the Eastern, so in the Western Church, which was formed round the old capital of the Western Empire of Rome, the clergy is the ruling corporation. Only, as there the Bishop and Metropolitan, so here the Pope is supreme; synods and councils fall more and more into the background. In each, also, the despotic form of ecclesiastical sway has prevailed over the lay form of government, and is, again, essentially influenced

by the despotism of the princes and nobles, which has become the state. In the West, however, man has had strength enough to make one despotism a check upon the other; in early days, the temporal upon the spiritual; in modern times, reversing the principle, the spiritual upon the temporal. In other words, the oppressed or repulsed spirit of freedom has instinctively used, sometimes a Pope, sometimes an Emperor, as its protector and tool.

Rome, in the nomination of Bishops, as everywhere else, makes the direct reverse of the Apostolical institution the principle of her Canon law. In her eyes, the episcopal power emanates from the papal, and the Pope ought strictly, as matter of right, to nominate all Bishops. Where this is not the case, it arises from usurpation, or special arrangement and treaty (concordat). This is, in principle, the same absolutism which, five centuries later, made its appearance in a temporal form. The clergy, which at first dispossessed the laity, and afterwards oppressed them, fell in consequence under the yoke of the Bishops; and these again under that of the Popes; the Princes shared with the latter the spoil, as soon as they felt themselves strong enough. The monastic orders formed the only free societies in this despotic system, but even they, by little and little, fell under the general thraldom.

Here, again, the Reformation established the saving principle of liberty, and the correct basis of a universal priesthood. But the avidity of princes, the thirst for plunder on the part of the nobility, the rage of the anti-reforming powers, and that decay of civilization among the people which was the result of the religious wars in Germany and France, rendered all free development in the leading countries of Europe impossible. The rage of controversy among divines made the people indifferent to ecclesiastical matters, and the jurist, as usual, framed for the princes a divine right out of usurpation. It is only the nineteenth century, after various reforms and revolutions, that has awakened the two great germs of life in the Evangelical Church: the missions to foreign countries, and the Diaconate in the old sense, or the so-called Home or Inner Mission. The restoration of the Institute of Deaconesses (not by the French, as has

lately been said in England, but by Germans) is a remarkably significant feature. Both have led to combinations and associations in Church life, beyond the limits of municipal life. The union of the two Protestant confessions (the Lutheran and the Reformed) with Synods composed of laity and clergy, in the greater part of Protestant Germany, is a vast step in the right direction. But Synods cannot govern; and, without Christian self-government, the very principle of vitality is wanting. The torpid Lutheranism of the Swedish Church has, like the whole constitutional life of that nation, out-lived itself, and is waiting for reanimation by means of the indestructible vitality of the Northmen. The Danish Episcopacy is a mere state-machine. So were the bishops nominated for the coronation of the first king of Prussia, who stood there without father and without children, and melted away like a dream. The only hope of life for the new Prussian Episcopate is the possibility of its entering into an organic connexion with the truly vital and national element, the Synods, a connexion which at present does not exist.

The English Church, beyond the parochial cure of souls which is now on the whole excellent, has practically lost the constitutional institutions of med ieval Catholic government, with the exception of the Episcopate, and has not acquired one single element of Protestant, nor consequently of Apostolical, constitutional life. She establishes Catholic hierarchism without its hierarchical independence in reference to the state, and professes Protestant principles without being able to show any of their faults in this domain. But she has preserved in the idea of the Episcopacy, as the constitutional kingship in the spiritual community, the natural and genuine Germanic organ of self-government! and it is to be hoped she will maintain it, if ever the spirit of Church reform should take possession of the English people by a national movement. The Congregation, or Parish, have no ecclesiastical rights; because the law of the Church is still the Canon law of the old clerical corporation. By a mysterious interpolation of the original draft of the Articles, as agreed upon in the Convocation of 1571, "the Church" (which according to the Ecclesiastical Law is the

Clergy in Convocation) "hath the power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith." (Note C.) The Colonial is a truly missionary Church. In the Foreign Mission of the Church the number of English missionaries is still insufficient. Home Mission the Church has none, but that of the Scripture Readers in the metropolis and in Ireland. The Diaconate is extinct. The Dissenters have no national institutions, but much discipline and congregational life. The only fruitful union between Church and Dissent, besides the Greek Bible Society, is in the City Mission, a noble form of Home Mission, although less complete than the German. The spirit of political liberty which pervades the nation supplies, to a certain extent, the want of ecclesiastical freedom.

Scotland is what Holland would be without the spiritual influence of Germany; a rigid, although a morally highly respectable, Presbyterianism of the seventeenth century. In this Presbyterianism, however, the element of hierarchism, in a popular garb, is so predominant, that lately a dispute as to the supreme decision upon what is spiritual and what is temporal, in a mixed question of rights, has been turned into a vital question of communion with Christ, and made a source of bitter separation. Such a view has essentially a papistic element in it; with this difference, indeed, that the Church does not combat a foreign despotic legislation, but her own national legality. There is no other way of explaining this strange phenomenon (in which, nevertheless, the most noble heroism has manifested itself), but by the circumstance, that, in consequence of the atrocious persecutions and oppressions of the popular element by English supremacy and hierarchical episcopacy in the seventeenth century, and by an unjust law of patronage passed after the union in the eighteenth, the State is still viewed in the light of an enemy by the popular Church.

All these phenomena, however, can only be fully accounted for by the incredible confusion respecting the relation between the Church and State; that is to say, between the nation as an ecclesiastical body and the nation as a political body; a confusion which continues to this hour. It is the history of the struggle between two usurping or dictatorial powers: a long

history of sorrow and suffering, in the course of which we meet the scaffold and the stake.

A century after Hippolytus, Christianity became, under Constantine, from a persecuted sect, a recognized religion, and, with the passing exception of Julian, the religion of the rulers, and of the imperial army by which they governed.

Even before the end of the fourth century it was the dominant religion, and the Catholic Church enjoyed exclusive privileges. From the time of Theodosius downwards, the emperors carried out a system of persecution, and the bishops rivalled them in an almost Apocalyptic manner. Christianity was from the very beginning admitted into the empire as an episcopal and Catholic corporation, which centred more and more round the great imperial cities of Rome (and New-Rome), Alexandria, and Antioch. The Protector considered the bishops partly in the light of helpmates, partly in the light of subjects; and this is the point of a convivial joke of the emperor Constantine, which has been immortalized by Eusebius, comparing himself with the bishops as an Episcopus (overseer) of the external affairs of the State. His system was despotic monarchy, so was theirs. It is just as rational to build upon this a right of supremacy, as it is to establish the theory of passive obedience, and the right divine of absolute princes, by referring to Christian governments the words of the Gospel and Apostles meant for Nero and Neronian prefects. Constantine was the first, but already a complete, Byzantine despot, and would have remained so had he survived his baptism. The first result of the protectorate of the Christian emperors was, that in their codes they converted Church ordinances (that about baptism, for instance) into statute laws. Thus Justinian, at the beginning of the sixth century, ordered new-born infants to be baptized, under a penalty for neglecting it: a law which still passes for a Christian principle in the code of many a Christian state. Evangelical and Apostolical freedom thus received its death-blow from the same police crutch which was given it for support. It has remained in the same crippled state to this day in the East.

The hierarchical thirst for power in the bishops of the old

capital of the West, favoured by the impressionable character and sense of veneration of an aspiring nationality, that of the German, formed the relation of the Church to the State in the papal sense. The same work was done in the Churches of the East, among the Slavonic tribes, grouped around New Rome, in the imperial sense. The Congregation disappeared here also, under the form of an unorganized "People," which might accept with favour the priestly election of the bishop, or contest it with arms and in blood, in the interest of another priestly candidate. The Presbyters, with the other clergy, domineered over the congregation; the Bishops over the priests; the Metropolitan over the bishops; and lastly, the Pope over them all directly, and besides, indirectly over the bishops through the metropolitans, and over the congregations, i. e. the nations, through the priests and monks. The Goths resisted; the Frankish Carlovingians leagued themselves with Rome, which, at that same moment, introduced into Germany the complete system of spiritual absolutism by means of Boniface, a West-Saxon Englishman brought up at Rome, the founder of the archbishopric of Mayence. Charlemagne, who had, it is true, a tendency towards absolute government, but who was, nevertheless, a genuine German king, so correctly foresaw the result, that towards the close of his life he expressed deep repentance for having allowed the stolen crown of the Byzantine emperors to be placed on his head at the altar of St. Peter's by a Roman priest. Not less warranted was the grief of his Franks, that the lying and despotic title of Emperor was substituted for the national and constitutional Germanic title of King, in the sense in which it still exists in England. The papal power naturally prevailed over the imperial; for it represented the spiritual and human element in opposition to the military power and feudal violence of the princes and nobles.

A real, complete nationality, like that of the ancient world, could not be formed, for this very reason, that the highest moral responsibility was wanting, the national decision on spiritual matters, by which nations become of age. The conscience of the German nation, then the predominant one, lay buried under the altar on which the first so-called Roman emperor of the

New Occident had received the Byzantine crown. Besides this, the Byzantine law, which deifies absolutism, was introduced from Italy: as well as papal supremacy, a well-merited punishment for the injustice committed by the Germans towards the free cities of Italy. After the vitality of the Germanic people was thus crippled to a vast extent (and in Romanic Gaul, which, by the Frank conquest, did not cease to be Celtic, all this took place to a still greater degree), a national feeling sprang up for the first time, on a small scale, in the free cities of Germany in the thirteenth century. It was within them, and through them, that the first spark of the internal as well as external life of the future was kindled.

When, two centuries afterwards, the Reformation gave to this element of life form and consistency, the nationality of Church life which the Reformation called forth, yea postulated and hallowed, established itself in opposition to the Clergy-corporation, as a sovereign right, which is expressed by the word "Supremacy." The Evangelical Prince took the place of the people, who were not yet reorganized as a community. This is the origin of the modern antagonisim of Church and State, or State and Church. The supremacy, or the *jus majestaticum circa sacra*, is nothing but the dictatorial form of defending the national liberty against clergy-corporation and canon law; with the dictatorship that antagonism ends, but not necessarily all relation between the Church and Nation.

The rude and plunder-loving nobility joined the princely despotism; the jurist made a virtue of necessity, and a master of the head of the Church. The Church was even plundered and oppressed in many a republic, where, however, Presbyterianism infused into the Church the germ of life by the establishment of Synods, consisting of laymen and spiritual delegates, and superintendents (bishops), somewhat after the model of the primitive Church. I have shown elsewhere by what artifices this germ was kept under and confined, forced back, and crippled. In the United States, where these means were not used, the formula of "Separation of Church and State" was established: a doctrine which is marked by a blind reaction against the idea of a National Church, as identical with the old

State-Church. It was also in the United States that the purely clerical Church of Episcopal England grew into a congregational one, although its clerical doctrine and its exclusive Anglicanism will never allow it to become, in this imperfect state, the expression of that gigantic new Anglo-Saxon nationality.

It must be always borne in mind, that in Europe, wherever untrammelled by clerical or police restraint, the universal conscience (commonly called public opinion) has pronounced this verdict: "It is not well that the political government should rule the Church; but it is better than that the ecclesiastical corporation, through the Church, should subjugate both government and people." Some men of noble minds have a leaning towards papacy, occasionally without being aware of or wishing it, either because they are weary of police restraint, or because they are unwilling to throw into the political scale the sacred interests of the Church, and to embroil her guardians in the party struggles of the day for power. But this marks only a period of transition: as a system for the future it is a short-sighted, insufficient, and destructive policy, to which the best men among them will not long adhere.

If we hold up this general picture before the mirror of the Apostolical Church, we shall see reflected this formula: The government of the Church by sovereign protectors can only be regarded as a dictatorship, and, consequently, as a mere temporary and transitory form. The true restoration must begin by recognizing the congregation as the primitive vehicle of Church life, commencing with the local, and ending with the national congregation. In this manner the protectorial connexion, like every other dictatorship, may pave the way to freedom and renewed vitality. In most cases, the dictator has it still in his power to bring about such a happy consummation in a conservative form. Its formula I believe to be in the following axioms:

Bishops and elders are essentially Rulers. Rulers must have Power. Power must have Law. Law must have People. The Church-People, to make laws, must have organized Congregations. Congregations must form Synods, which are representative congregations. Synods must represent organically the lay

and the clergy elements. The clerical element is either a parochial or an ecclesiastical one. The complete Synod, therefore, will in general have three orders: first, the Bishops or superintendents, personally; secondly, the deputies of the parochial Clergy: and thirdly, the representatives of the Laymen, elected either by the communicants of the congregations, or by the lay elders forming the Church-council or presbytery. These last must have the right to demand the vote by order, and thus exercise their legislative veto by themselves. Bishops elected or nominated without the cooperation of the synod have no natural ecclesiastical basis.

III.

THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION.

The two bright points in the ancient Church, as regards its constitution, are the Episcopate and the Congregational organization. These two Institutions have an undying vitality; the rest is obsolete and inapplicable.

The Episcopate was originally the independent position of a city clergyman, presiding over the congregation with the neighbouring villages, having a body of Elders attached to him. Where such a council can be formed, there is a complete Church, a bishopric. The Elders are teachers and administrators. If an individual happen to be engaged in either of these offices more exclusively than the other, it makes no real alteration in his position, for the Presbyters of the ancient Church filled both situations. Their office was literally an office, not a rank. The country clergymen were most probably members of the ecclesiastical council of the city Church: as the bishops of the country towns certainly were members of the metropolitan presbytery.

Now, if we make a practical application of this idea to our own circumstances, the restoration of the bishopric would give us a district like a small English county; that is to say, a district including a town, which combines within it all the elements requisite for the organization of a full congregation, and especially, therefore, one which contains an educational establishment or school.

As regards the formation of diocesan congregations (synods), however, we must supply the defects of the Churches of the third century, which produced such bitter fruits. We must make them consist, not of bishops and other ecclesiastics merely, but also of lay delegates from the single congregations.

It must depend upon the particular relations and circumstances of the case how far any steps can be taken towards Provincial and National Synods. Uniformity is the most

dangerous foe of unity, because it gives the appearance of real internal unity, and conceals the want of it; while, on the other hand, it elevates the external above the real.

As to National Church life, the aim must be, a union between different Protestant communities, on the basis on which it has been proposed in Prussia: a common Liturgy, with full liberty as to its use in the parts connected with theological controversies between Lutherans and Calvinists, and a common Synodical constitution. This union has been carried into effect in the greater part of Protestant Germany, since 1817, although in an imperfect and not always quite correct manner, which very naturally has produced the reaction of the last few years. But the idea of such a union lives, as a cherished national and Christian project, in the minds of an overwhelming majority among the higher and middle classes. Arnold laboured to bring about something of a similar kind in England.

The point of union in the extra-national or Catholic life of the Church is based upon the universality of the theological and philosophical literature of the European world, as the national ecclesiastical life is upon the organ of the intelligence of the public mind, the national literature. But the first condition requisite for bringing about a really living union of the national Churches is, cooperation for a common, elevating, truly human, and Christian purpose. True Alliance is impossible without such a practical purpose; and free cooperation, not union, is the watchword.

Such a purpose is furnished eminently by the Mission. Through its means, a blessed cooperation of the English and German Churches has been already effected. The obligation that those who are sent out by the Church Missionary Society should receive English ordination, arises simply and solely from the peculiar connexion between the English Church and State. Although the Catholicizing portion of the clergy attaches to ordination fanatical and superstitious notions, men of God, like Schwartz, Gobat, and Krapff, the apostles of India, Abyssinia, and Equatorial Africa, have felt that this should not prevent them from combining with it a rational view. Nor should the German missionaries, when they return home, feel any scruple

about being ordained in the German and Swedish sense, that is, suffering themselves to be instituted to any given office with blessing and prayer, where even the laws of the country meet Episcopalian narrow-mindedness by an equally narrow Presbyterianism.

The whole idea of Ordination, in the sense of the High Church party, is as foreign to the ancient Church as it is incompatible with Evangelical doctrine.

So the indelibility of the canonical character of the clergy, although ascribed to pope Caius (283), is foreign to the ante-Nicene period. It has been argued in France, in favour of not allowing a right of civil marriage to priests seceding from the Church, that without it very many clergymen would throw off their gowns. A police regulation of this kind, however, seems as unworthy of a Church of the Gospel, and of a free Germanic land, as the restoration of the restraints of the walls of a cloister. So it has even been felt in Belgium, where the priest does not lose his rights as a citizen, if he resign his clerical office.

Thus much upon the applicability of the Episcopate, as one of the two vital institutions of the ancient Church. Those Churches who have it ought to reform it, if they will boast of Apostolicity: those who have it not would do well to restore it, in order to find in it a means for creating and maintaining a self-governing national Church. It is an historical fact that the Episcopate has done more than any other institution to maintain in England the independence of the Church from the despotism of princes, ministers, and parliaments; and it is another fact that, with the exception of two small Presbyterian republics (Scotland and Holland), and the National Scotch Church — all three Calvinistic, — no continental Church ever has obtained a free and a national existence except the Episcopal one of Sweden. A Government with titular Bishops having no power, and acting under the supreme control and guidance of the Minister of the Interior, or Police, or of Worship, is worse than an undisguised bureaucratic Church: no title, no liturgy even, can supply the want of the first condition of life and authority, an independent, self-governing corporate body, whether it be called Fiscal, Consistorial, or simply Government.

As to the second point, the organization of the local Congregational life of the people, the Episcopal Church of England has scarcely a trace of it, the congregation, as such, possessing no ecclesiastical rights, and having no canonical redress against their clergyman and bishop, nor any control over their own congregational affairs beyond the pecuniary check exercised in some trifling matters by the vestry. At this point Church reform must begin. Any such reform is impossible, without the organization of the congregational life, the right of a limited veto, and a system of election for being represented in diocesan synods. The theoretical controversy, whether the revival of the synodical life of the Church ought to emanate, in the first place, from the Convocation, or from a Royal Commission, can, practically, only be settled in the second or national, not in the clerical, sense. All the historical precedents are besides in its favour. But parliamentary interference ought only to come in at the last stage, when a new charter of the Church is to be legally acknowledged and confirmed: for the fiction of the Parliament being, as it were, the lay branch of the Convocation, is entirely destroyed by the late political reforms. The right of free assent cannot be denied to the clergy: but it does not seem to follow, that they must exercise it in the form of Convocation, which itself has usurped the place of the Synod.

The Episcopal Church of Sweden has done more for the congregation; and her further reform is, comparatively speaking, easy, because she has abolished the binding power of the Romish canon law, without the repeal of which no national Church can move a single step in the way of reconstructive reform.

The Reformed Churches of Holland and Germany have only to preserve, purify, and complete the synodic element, in order to come up to the constitutional model of primitive Christianity; it being well understood, that the principle must be preserved of considering those only as members who live in communion with the Church. But it is a folly to expect anything from any form of Church government which is not emancipated from police control. In this sphere little has been done in Germany except in provincial Reformed or United Churches. However, the new element of free Christian association, coupled with a re-

stored diaconate in the ancient sense, is the vocation of the day, and this element comes from Protestant Germany. The Deaconesses of Kaiserswerth, who serve its hospitals, educate the orphans, and reform the fallen, and the Associations of the Inner Mission of Wichern, which are more and more covering Protestant Germany with a network of practical charity and brotherhood, are the living evidences of the Spirit of God in the German Church, enabling her to sing, in all humility, in spite of all her revilers, and in the midst of deep affliction, her old hymn:

"Er ist mit uns wohl auf dem Plan
Mit seinem Geist und Gaben!"

BOOK III.

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE, AND THE CHURCH LITURGY OR ORDER OF DIVINE SERVICE.

I.

THE PICTURE.

After what I have said in the Second Book, and in other works, it only remains, in this place, to consider the Liturgy, and that of the Communion Service in particular, from the point of view of Universal History, in order to elucidate the idea of the Christian sacrifice, and to point out the grand epochs in its development. These considerations will therefore be the key to the complete view of the epochs of the Sacramental Liturgies of the ancient Church which we exhibit in the Third Volume of the Analecta, based upon all that exists of genuine documents.

The original liturgical arrangements of the earliest Church appear very scanty, if we look in them for forms of prayer. Their almost exclusive object was to give the usual order of the service, and especially the order of the acts which constituted, according to the custom of the second century, the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The commencement of each of these acts was, as a general rule, marked or introduced by the primitive symbolic forms of mutual salutation and benediction on the part of the clergy and congregation, or by the responsive recitation of a verse of the Psalms. What is thus solemnly announced is an organic part of the service: and the fundamental idea of the whole worship is, that it is a common act of the people, commencing by teaching and singing, and concluding with prayer and

blessing. Now this act is an external one, in the ordinary sense of the word; and in that sense there are only two great acts in the service, the Oblation and the Communion. The Oblation is the offering of contributions to the Lord's Supper, either for the love-feast, or for the clergy and poorer part of the congregation, and includes the placing on the communion-table of the bread and wine. The Communion is the Supper of the people, the Kiss of Peace the solemn preparation either for the Oblation or for the Communion. But there are also spiritual acts. Such are Prayer, whether petition or thanksgiving; such is, in an eminent sense, the Sacrificial Prayer, the expression of the act of internal self-sacrifice, of which the consecration of the elements is only the introduction. Thus the whole service was the spiritual act of the worshipping congregation. The external act was combined with praying: it was sacred only so far as it was symbolical of some inner act, more clearly expressed by prayer. The external posture (standing up, bending, or kneeling) which accompanied the word had likewise such a symbolical meaning. But whether a sacred word, or solemn position, all was equally meant to represent what took place internally, and had no essential value except as thus being a sign of that real internal act of the mind. The congregational service, therefore, was principally worship, and the sacrifice the culminating point of the act. But the preparatory teaching, also, like the preparatory confession of sins and the prayers, took the form of acts, inasmuch as the congregation expressed their participation in the reading of Scripture and in the sermon, as well as in that confession and in these prayers, by the responsive act of saying or singing Amen! Hallelujah! or a responsive sentence or hymn. The sermon itself, however, was, like every prayer except the Lord's Prayer, and the words of the Invocation of the Spirit, an extemporization: it was a high spiritual act, a living manifestation of that Spirit of God which was promised and given to the congregation of believers.

According to the ancient Church there is no Christian worship except where the people perform such an inward act, and, therefore, in the higher sense, no worship without sacrifice. Now, the order, sequence, and import of the individual portions of

these sacred acts, the aim and scope of the Church Prayer uttered, are usually enumerated or intimated in this our general frame. The prayers which we read in the present Greek text of the "Apostolic Constitutions" bear self-evident proofs of a later date, by the very circumstance of their not being found in the earlier and purer texts, and by their being very unskilfully inserted. Even the most ancient liturgical formulary, namely, that which is inserted into the Abyssinian text of the "Apostolical Constitutions" of the Coptic Church, is not found in the original text of the Coptic Collection. Still, as my "Reliquiæ Liturgicæ" in the Analecta proves, there existed in the time of Hippolytus complete formularies of the real Communion Service, which were themselves already an amplification of a shorter formulary of the second century. But for these details we must refer our readers to the Reliquiæ Liturgicæ; for they cannot be understood except by a comparison with the later forms. The free use made of the Liturgies of our age shows that they were not rigorously prescribed formularies, and that they left much for free prayer and for selection. This applies in particular to the principal prayer, used at the eucharistic Thanksgiving, before the Lord's Supper, the prayer of consecration. This prayer, in its original shape, is a supplication that God will send down His Holy Spirit on the congregation, and sanctify their hearts: in the liturgical formularies the Spirit is called down on the congregation and on their offerings, in order that the latter may become to the communicants the Lord's Body and Blood. There was originally only one prescribed prayer here, namely, the Lord's Prayer; which, for this purpose, was amplified and extended liturgically, so as to include, implicitly or explicitly, that **Invocation of the Holy Spirit.**

The Sunday service consisted of two parts. The first commenced with singing of psalms out of the psalm-book, or of new psalms and hymns in the Greek or Roman metre. It concluded with the homily or sermon, that is to say, with the expounding of the portion of Scripture which had been read, coupled with a practical application and exhortation. The Catechumens, who had begun their course of instruction, were present at this part of the service. Strangers, likewise, might be present as

guests, or to satisfy their curiosity. The Catechumens were dismissed with a prayer and blessing before the Lord's Supper was celebrated. According to the Alexandrian Constitutions this prayer and blessing might be delivered by a layman; a relic of the most ancient Apostolical freedom of teaching and praying in the congregation. All strangers were then enjoined to withdraw from the worship of the Believers. The Believers hereupon expressed generally their brotherhood by saluting each other with the kiss of peace: the men the men, and the women the women. This was done in imitation of the custom established, as it appears, by Christ among His disciples. The solemnity was devised to hallow the desecrated human body, and restore the desecrated temple of God: it was maintained in the midst of a corrupt and sneering world, with that courage which faith alone inspires.

This service, likewise, of the Believers had its own Church-singing, and we may venture to consider as one of the earliest of them the Morning Hymn, the most venerable of all, to which Pliny the Younger unmistakably alludes, and the older form of which we think we have restored. The Christians used, besides, several other morning and evening hymns. Spiritual odes, private hymns, especially for morning and evening devotion, likewise enlivened domestic life. We give an evening hymn of primitive Greek origin, which is akin to the old Hellenic salutation of light when the evening lamp was lighted. Learned private compositions, like the one with which the "Pedagogue" of Clemens of Alexandria concludes, do not belong to this class. They were never used by the congregations, and, indeed, were as little adapted as they were intended for that purpose. Every thing really old and genuine which belongs here is given fully in our Text-Book, the Notes to which furnish all requisite information.

The first of the two principal acts in the celebration of the Lord's Supper was the offering of gifts on the part of the members of the Church, and the placing of them on the communion-table, or under and by the side of it, by the clergy, the elders of the congregation, and their assistants. Now this offering, and the thanks for the offered gifts in a prayer of

blessing, called by Irenæus the sacrificial act of Christian piety, are, as is shown in detail in the Second Part, an Apostolic institution. It is impossible to doubt the truth of such a statement, if we read our Text-Book, and consider the general custom of the ancient Christian congregations. The material misunderstanding of this so simply venerable and deeply significant act, and the mystico-magical superstition which has gradually been engrafted upon it, are fully explained, as can now be authentically proved, by the entire perversion of the original notions of Sacrifice, Church, and Priesthood. But this explanation implies the admission of that custom being a primitive one, and instituted by the Apostles.

When the Sunday observance was extended beyond the apartments of individual believing families, and special rooms for prayer were appointed, the picture of this act of Oblation can be represented in its fullest details. The members of the Church who had any thing to give (frequently the minority, therefore), not only took upon themselves the charge of the bread and wine for the Lord's Supper, but likewise brought with them the first-fruits of corn, wine, and oil, and other gifts of the season. With this Oblation the Service of the Believers originally began. When all those who were not members of the congregation had withdrawn, the persons offering and other communicants drew near the altar. The elders and their assistants received every thing, and arranged the gifts in order, placing them on or round the table of the Holy Supper, the visible centre of the great act.

Thus when, with a wonderful instinct, the oblong basilica-form, with the apse at the end, was established as the generally prevailing type for the Hall of Prayer (and the first adulterated Greek Collection so gives it), the clergy took their places in that circular building, the old tribunal, on both sides of the bishop's chair; the congregation stood in the nave and the side aisles, if the building contained such, the men and women apart. The table, which the inward sacrifice of believers, as brothers in Christ, made the altar of mankind, stood in the only natural place for it, between the clergy and congregation. Thus its position was very soon fixed in the intersection of the transepts

and the nave, or the entrance of the chancel. When the Service of the Believers was about to begin, the clergy approached the altar from one side, the congregation from the other. The bishop, or officiating elder, stood behind or by the side of the altar, looking towards the congregation. The direction of the Church was usually, but without any superstitious law upon the subject, from east to west: in the Eastern Church the apse formed the east side; in Rome the opposite direction seems to have originally prevailed. I have shown all this in detail in my work on the Roman Basilicas, and in the plates belonging to it.

The congregation had now "built itself up;" that is to say, the feeling of their mutual community with God through Christ, as the Eternal High Priest, had become strong in their souls. In this tone of mind, with this consciousness, they advanced to the great act, the object of the ceremony. This act, as cannot be too often repeated, was the thankful sacrifice of Self, a vow which was to be pledged here, to be sealed in the Lord's Supper, and realized by continual struggle in life for the promotion of the kingdom of God. What appeared externally was the offering of the bread and wine: the internal action was the act of sacrifice on the part of the Church in gratitude for the mercies and blessings of God, with especial thankful remembrance of the sacrificial death of Jesus for mankind. This internal act was from the very first expressed in words, not simply in symbolical signs. The Spirit found its own sign, the Word. This word was of a twofold character, the one fixed, the other free. The liturgically amplified and adapted Lord's Prayer was the fixed symbolical element: the free prayer consisted in a form of praise of God, the Creator, the Sustainer, and Saviour, a form transferred from the thanksgiving offered by every head of a Jewish family before meat. The Invocation of the Spirit was expressed either by the Lord's Prayer, or in the prayer of Thanksgiving. Our records state that it was left to every bishop and elder to express the outpouring of the thankful heart, uttered in the soul of the congregation, before the Feast of Love, in words suggested by the Spirit at the

moment. This point is so firmly established, that it is unnecessary for me to add any thing on the subject.

But it is important to prove three things, which have hitherto been by no means fully acknowledged, and still less demonstrated. First, that our present complete form of the Lord's Prayer has grown out of its being used in this act for the purpose of calling down a blessing upon the thanksgiving congregation. Secondly, that in this liturgically amplified Lord's Prayer, the germ of the ecclesiastical prayer of Consecration was already developed at the end of the first century. Thirdly, that the established prayers of Consecration, in the fourth and fifth centuries, and the whole set of the prayers of Oblation, or the prayers preceding the administration of the Supper, sprang from the union of the ecclesiastical Lord's Prayer and the originally free prayer of the Jewish thanksgiving: to which prayers the words of Institution, cited historically, were joined.

A series of testimony, reaching down to Gregory the Great, proves that the entire act of prayer was originally frequently represented by the Lord's Prayer alone, but was never performed without it. Now, in this ancient custom, and in no other cause, originated our concluding doxology in the Lord's Prayer, as well as the "Amen;" that is to say, the two additions which appear in uncritical editions of the New Testament, as well as in the ecclesiastical translations, as a portion of the text of St. Matthew's Gospel (vi. 13.; compare Luke, xi. 4.). The consecrating prayer before the Lord's Supper, from which all our Church prayers have been made, had, as intimated above, a double historical basis. One was the prayer such as the head of a Jewish family uttered before eating, and before the distribution of the wine, and such as Christ at the Last Supper uttered, "blessing;" that is to say, the giving of thanks, with especial reference to His own sacrificial death. The account of this event (the Institution of the Supper, as it is called) might at the Church ceremony be presumed to be known, or might be recited on account of its universal importance. The prayer which the Lord Himself uttered at the Last Supper was nowhere recorded, nor was it destined to be used on any other occasion. The president of

the assembled Christian community spoke as the Spirit gave him utterance, but, from all the indications which we find, this thanksgiving, arising from the Jewish thanksgiving for the gifts of bread and wine, became a general thanksgiving for all the other blessings bestowed by God. Such, then, was the basis of that prayer which had reference to the gifts, to their offering, and to the partaking of the same.

The other basis, the Lord's Prayer, was unconnected with the Supper, or any thing external; it was a general supplication. To it the especial prayer for the occasion, that the Holy Ghost might be poured down on the congregation preparing for the sacrifice, may have been joined. Finally, any such prayer must have concluded with the praise of God.

Both elements must have been in various ways combined. The supplication for the outpouring of the Spirit on the congregation might be united with the thanks for the bread and wine set before them: the praise of God with thankfulness for His gifts. The sacrifice of the worshipping believers, the culminating point of the internal act, was symbolically intimated by the offering and consecration of the gifts, sealed and substantiated by the grateful partaking in remembrance of Christ and of His sacrificial death. When the Spirit of the congregation sought for words to express this act of sacrifice, it might find them in the Lord's Prayer or in a free prayer, or in both.

Let us first of all examine the relation between the Lord's Prayer and the three parts of the act of prayer, from the offering to the distribution of the elements: first, the supplication; secondly, the praise and thanksgiving; or, in theological terms, the precatory, the eucharistic, and the sacrificial prayers. To these were to be added, finally, the utterance, by the congregation, of their concordance with the vows of their minister, if he said the prayer; or by the minister, of his participation in those of the people, if (as in the Greek Church) they said the Lord's Prayer. The three parts of the liturgically extended Lord's Prayer are in exact correspondence with these three acts: the petitions, with the supplication; the doxology, with the praise and thanksgiving; the Amen, with the general

concordance. Now those petitions were originally only six: the seventh is nothing but the response of the worshipping congregation to what precedes. This will explain the fact that the one half of the ancient tradition omits this seventh petition in the text of the Gospel of St. Luke: if it had originally formed a part of the text, it would never have been left out in a MS. Secondly, we have here the explanation of a custom prevalent in many ancient Churches, of the minister repeating the Lord's Prayer as far as the words, "And lead us not into temptation;" and of the people answering, "But deliver us from evil:" or *vice versâ*. In some Liturgies the response begins even with the fifth petition, "Lead us not into temptation;" but all our manuscripts of the Gospel attribute these words to Christ himself. Thus much as to the Scriptural text of the petition having been amplified by the Primitive Communion Service. But it is a fact capable of direct proof, that the second of the six original petitions was modified for this purpose. It is only by the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer at this place that we can explain the otherwise utterly unintelligible origin of the reading to which Tertullian alludes as that of the Marcionites, and which Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus give and notice as an ancient authentic reading; namely, instead of the supplication: "Thy kingdom come," these words: "The Holy Ghost descend upon us and purify us."

As a various reading of the model prayer given by Christ to the Apostles, this is absolute nonsense; as the germ of the development of the prayer of consecration from the Lord's Prayer, it is invaluable. For it contains the fundamental thought of the more extended Church prayer of consecration, to which Irenæus already alludes: the supplication that the Holy Spirit may descend upon us and sanctify our hearts. This is the original idea: the invocation of the blessing of the Spirit upon the bread and wine which we are about to partake of as the body of our Lord is an amplification.

The fundamental idea of all Christian worship, the thankful self-sacrifice, was never so fully expressed by the ancient Church as would have been desirable when the liturgical for-

mularies became fixed. It was a fatal circumstance, that the service of adoration, or self-sacrifice, was not separated from the celebration of the Lord's Supper at the time when the Communion of the whole congregation ceased, or before that period. The substitution of a mock oblation for the real oblation of the people, was another step in the wrong direction. On this point, the principles have been established in the Essays: the Liturgies in the Analecta exhibit the details.

Two facts, however, must be pointed out here, on account of subsequent misunderstandings, of which we shall have to speak presently. The Communion was always preceded by a prayer of consecration, either the Lord's Prayer or a special prayer of Invocation, or both. Now, as the self-offering was nothing but the highest point of the consecration prayer, it always took place *before* the Communion; it never followed it. The Communion was the sealing of the sacrifice, of the vow of the believer, but it was not a sacrifice itself, nor was the real sacrifice merely an expression of thanks for the Communion: on the contrary, it was, and is, independent of the Communion. That during the sixth century the Roman Church said it after the Communion, if at all, is a curious circumstance, which can nly be accounted for by a misunderstanding of the ancient custom of not writing down those words in the formularies for the Communion, any more than the free prayer of thanksgiving.

Having established this point as the first liturgical germ of the Communion Service, we can now, with greater distinctness, trace a picture according to the different epochs of the Communion Service.

The expression, by liturgical formularies, of the new internal life of mankind in God commenced with the Lord's Prayer and free thanksgiving in the first age of the Apostles. When the worshipping congregation became conscious of having a place in the world's history, which was the case after the first, and still more after the second and final, destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian, the spirit sought for more definite expressions of that inward life and act. At the same time, also, the solemnity itself, and the symbolical signification of the act of offering and of the thing offered, became more significant. The third century

had a more developed Liturgy than the second; but the free prayer seems to have still had a place by the side of the formulary. A solemn set of words for the Invocation of the Spirit upon the people, or upon the people and their oblations, was, as it appears, always used in every Church, from the early part of the second century. But the Coptic Constitutions prove that the congregation had jealously insisted that every minister should on the whole deliver his prayer of thanksgiving as the Spirit gave him utterance, with this condition, that he must address it to the only true God and Creator, the Father of the Son, and Sender of the Spirit, and not to a God of the philosophical schools; in short, as an orthodox Christian.

The Spirit of God alone, therefore, knows in what terms the Church expressed her sacrifice when she entered upon her second century, after the last Apostle had gone to his rest, which, on the whole, corresponds with the period when the celebration of the Lord's Supper was entirely separated from the meal, and became part of the early Morning Service. Justin Martyr says, in good Greek (which, I am sorry to say, even Bingham has misinterpreted), that the officiating elder uttered his thanksgiving as well as he could, that is to say, as far as the Spirit enabled him to do justice to the grand object, the Christian thanksgiving. The form of words inspired by the Spirit must have been various, and if the Spirit did not supply the offerer with such forms, the Lord's Prayer, as amplified in the Liturgy, must have been substituted, and silent prayer used instead of words. We know, however, if we know anything at all, that, as late as the fourth and fifth (yea, the sixth and seventh) centuries, the Communion Service was still considered merely as an act of thanksgiving of the congregation for their redemption, and not at all as a repetition of the sacrifice of atonement. Nothing was further from the thoughts of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries than the notion of a magical operation of the Spirit on the material elements, the bread and wine.

And here is the inmost centre, the true mystery of the Christian worship.

The Communion itself, the second of these two outwardly

visible acts, had grown into the symbolical meal of worship, as an early morning, or at least ante-prandial, solemnity; whereas the proper meal, as a feast of brotherhood and love (agape), was celebrated at their evening meeting, partly in the Hall of Prayer itself, partly in private houses. This meal was, and remained, essentially a congregational meal, to which every person who had any thing to bring offered his contribution.

Thus worship continued to be the main feature in the Service of the Believers, as instruction was the preparatory service, in which the Catechumens also took part. In both the congregation "built itself up" as the Temple of God: as an outward temple is necessarily constructed of single blocks, so is the congregation built up of single souls. This deep symbol, which pervades all the languages of Christian nations, is based upon expressions and exhortations of the Apostles, and springs from the deepest feeling of the peculiarity of Christian worship. There is no trace of it either in Judaism or Paganism.

The Supplication Prayer might be used in all parts of the service, and in the most ancient instances of its occurrence was sometimes used before, sometimes after, the consecration. Thanksgiving was mixed up with it, and thanksgiving was the conclusion of the celebration of Lord's Supper.

There is no doubt that the commemoration of the departed brethren had also in very early times a precatory clause, expressing a wish for their perfect happiness. But the prominent feature is that of thanksgiving and joy. This alone is expressed in the records of our age. Origen says: "It seem proper to thank the Saints in the solemn prayers of the Church, for this reason also, that we are benefited by the remembrance of them." We find, likewise, in a very ancient commentary on the Book of Job, attributed to him: "We cherish the pious remembrance of the Saints and of our relatives and friends who have departed in faith, as well from joy for their deliverance, as in order to pray that we too may have a blessed end." All this is mentioned and fully discussed in Bingham, in the passage quoted above.

But what we wish to impress here upon the Christian inquirer is, that nothing of all this is found in the most ancient

formularies; and that not only the place and the expression were left free, but that none of these points formed part of the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the second century.

As to the details of this liturgical picture, we refer to the Introduction to the Liturgies of the second, third, and fourth centuries prefixed to the Third Volume of the Analecta.

II.

THE REFLEX.

1. *The Reflex of the Worship of the Eastern Church in the Mirror of the Apostolical Age.*

We are now about to exhibit the contrast and the analogy between the service of the Communion in the Apostolical age, and in the post-Nicene period.

The process of development which we have traced, respecting the consecration before prayer and the Christian sacrifice, is surprisingly confirmed by the very words in the extensive prayers of the Greek Church, as they became established and hallowed forms in the third and fourth centuries. The formularies of the second century were variously extended and amplified, and appear as fixed in the fourth century. We possess in Chrysostom's Homilies on the Liturgy of his Church authentic testimony in favour of their having had, towards the end of this century, in the principal Churches, substantially (although not identically) the same form which we find in the post-Nicene Alexandrian Liturgy, and in the oldest texts of the Constantinopolitan Liturgy, bearing the names of Basil and Chrysostom. It can be proved that these Fathers were not its authors; it contains both later and earlier elements. Chrysostom treats the formularies of his age already as the word of the Church, as traditional. We exhibit in the Analecta a Liturgy which belongs to the second century, and forms the connecting link between those formularies of the fourth century and the short formulas of the Churches of the Apostolic age, mixed up with free prayer, of which our Text-Book is intended to give the frame work. The early Liturgies were not literary productions, but the prayers of godly men which sprang from Church life, and which had been used with favour and blessing. As the consciousness of the Church in regard to her sacrifice was obscured, people adhered more and more closely to the

formulas which the great lights of the early ages, such as the two Fathers alluded to above, had used and perhaps here and there retouched. When the idea dies, formularies grow, like mushrooms, out of its grave.

Now, in all authentic Church formularies of prayers of consecration before the Communion, the words of that liturgical voice of the first century are echoed throughout: "May the Holy Ghost descend upon us, and purify us!"

The genuine words of consecration used in the fourth and fifth centuries at the celebration of the Lord's Supper contain, beyond all doubt, the development of the petition originally inserted into the Lord's Prayer itself concerning the sending down of the Spirit for the sanctifying of the people. The development of the second petition was thus, in the first century, the utterance of that Christian and Apostolic idea. The fuller development of the thanksgiving and self-consecration took place in the free prayer, properly called the Prayer of Consecration. In this prayer a certain solemn phraseology or mode of expression for invoking the Spirit was considered as sanctioned by the usage of the Church: the rest was free as to expression and extent, but fixed as to object and general tenour. The words of the Institution may or may not have been added to that prayer. Then followed fixed written formularies; but in all of them the consecration means a prayer, to which the recital of those words forms the historical introduction. It was nothing but pure misunderstanding in the dark ages of barbarism, to see in consecration, not the consecrating prayers, but the historical quotation of the words of Institution. But it is not a less barbarous mistake, to suppose that the sacrifice of the ancient Church was that of the elements, whether before or after the words of consecration. The Evangelical and Apostolical idea of the true sacrifice was, for reasons amply explained, already obscured, when the liturgical formularies became fixed. Still, in spite of the accumulation of the expressions, and in spite of the oblation prayers and those which immediately precede and follow the Communion being full of repetitions, the spiritual act of thankful self-sacrifice pervades all the Liturgies of the Eastern Church in the fourth and fifth centuries. It is this act, this vow, which

is symbolized by the Offering, sealed by the Communion, and sanctified by the Remembrance of the sacrificial death of Christ. The Liturgy named after Chrysostom expresses the prayer explicitly as a vow.

The Supplication Prayer was also strictly an intercessory prayer for all members of the Church, both for the brethren who had fallen asleep, and for the Apostles and the mother of our Lord. The saying of Augustin (cited by Innocent III. as Scriptural), "It offends the Martyr if any one prays for the Martyr," is one of the bold paradoxes of the great African, which have led to innovations, and become turning points in the internal history of the Church. The ancient Christians had not a clear conception of the real meaning of the very indefinite word "for," the general sense of which in the earliest Liturgies is partly "in the name of," partly "with reference to." But the thanksgiving for the deliverance of the deceased, as the new Christian element, is still the prominent feature, when mention is made of those who have departed in peace (*in pace*). Independently of the Jewish custom, it was indeed very natural that the expression of hope in the eternal happiness of departed believers, and of the feeling of "the Communion of Saints" beyond the limits of space and time, should be conjoined with this prayer; for, according to the views of the ancient Church, the souls of the departed had also a longing for the accomplishment of the number of the elect, and the complete triumph of the kingdom of God.

The connexion of this thanksgiving and this prayer in which mention was made of the departed with the celebration of the Eucharist, in the fourth and fifth centuries, was owing to the belief in the efficacy of the intercessory prayer of the Church, more especially when the believers celebrated the Holy Supper. This is stated by Cyril and Epiphanius. In the time of Prudentius, the cotemporary of the latter, the celebration of the Eucharist on the anniversary of the martyrdom of Hippolytus was regarded as a thanksgiving and bond of love, a strengthening of faith by looking up to those who had already finished their course. The idea of intercession for the souls of the departed, who were supposed to pass through a purifying fire, was first

introduced by and after Augustin, and, in fact, in the Western Church.

II. *The Reflex of the Communion Service of the Gauls of Spain, of Milan, and of Africa.*

The Eastern Liturgies thus still preserve, on the whole, the character of a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving in the minds of the congregation; and the decay of the age in which they became fixed shows itself more in the overgrowth of the ceremonial element, than in the corruption and change of that fundamental character.

That this was also the case, at least to a certain degree, in the ancient fixed Liturgies of the Gauls of Spain, of Africa, and even of Milan, is proved by the scanty genuine remains of their Sacramental Service. Our collection of Liturgies exhibits all these remains. They present, in the order of the Sacramental Prayers, the Greek type: particularly the Gallican and Mozarabic (of the Goths in Spain), which have the same origin, and in which, whatever is common to both may be safely considered, and in most cases can be proved to be, genuine. But the work of denationalizing the Churches of the West, particularly after Gregory the Great (who himself expresses more generous ideas in his truly Apostolic letter to Augustine, archbishop of Canterbury), began with the destruction of the canon, and the substitution of that of the Roman Church. This work of destruction has been most complete in the canon of the ritual of Milan, which, although called Ambrosian, is essentially that of the canon of Gregory. I believe I have shown that a great part of the ancient national consecration prayers still exist. But at all events we may say, that in the Liturgies of these Churches the character of Thanksgiving predominates: the precatory part is subordinate, the propitiatory idea of the rite excluded.

III. *The Reflex of the Communion Service of the Church of Rome.*

The case is different with the Sacramental Liturgy of Rome.

Whether we look to the text which Gregory the Great found, or to his own, or to the present official text, we find throughout, only in an increasing ratio, the character of the service changed from one preeminently thanksgiving to one of precatory prayers: the wish to propitiate becomes more and more predominant. Whoever compares this rite with that of the Greek Churches, will be struck by this immense difference; and any one who has studied the history of the religions of ancient Greece and Rome philosophically will agree with me, when I say that this difference is exactly of the same character as that which we discover in the doctrine and rites of the sacrifices of the ancient Romans and Hellenes. To propitiate God, and to make a covenant with Him under the most cautious, binding, and solemn clauses and formularies, is the standing character of Roman religion. It certainly, therefore, cannot be considered a step in advance, that the Roman ritual became very early, in this decisive part, the general order of the West. The original national Liturgies of Gaul and Spain, and of Milan, were much nearer the Greek model. Still the predominance of the Roman formulary was not entirely due to Carlovingian protection and Roman ingenuity and power. The Roman ritual had also its striking excellencies. The Gallican, Gothic, and Alemannic rituals are lengthy, full of rhetorical amplification and unnecessary details, often mere declamations; whereas the Roman formulary is distinguished, particularly in consequence of Gregory's judicious and, for the age in which he lived, tasteful reform, by that solemn conciseness which we admire in all the formularies of Roman antiquity. It was very natural, that classical terseness and metropolitan conciseness should prevail over provincial verbosity, of which St. Hilary's Prayer for the Dead furnishes a striking instance.

The Germanic mind, on the contrary, has always shown an irresistible affinity with the Hellenic mind, as well as with that spirit of filial thankfulness and gladness which is breathed in the Gospel and the Apostolic times.

IV. *The General Character of the Communion Services of the present Byzantine and Roman Churches.*

The solemn oblation, or act of offering of the people, originally formed the opening of the Communion Service: and was the real primitive offertory. Subsequently, this real oblation ceased; but the public oblation prayer of the priest remained, as the beginning of the prayer of consecration. The offertory became a mere sacerdotal prayer, accompanied by an antiphony sung by the choir. Subsequently, the old oblation prayer became a secret prayer of the priest, and the Offertory before the Preface was amplified into a very long offertorial service, referring only to the sacerdotal person about to offer the sacrifice. The priest had, indeed, become in the meantime the only acting person, and his recital of the words of Institution the culminating point, instead of the sacrifice of the worshippers. Thus the reality was more and more evanescent: the very idea of the Communion became a contradiction in terms: for, even if there was a communion of the people, it did not take place where it is marked in the service, but after the prescribed service was over.

It was very necessary, therefore, that many of the prayers of the fifth and sixth centuries should be read low, not aloud, for they had lost their meaning, and had become a mere form.

The Greek Church has retained the type which was imprinted in the fifth century, and has become petrified with and in it. Her canon of the Communion Service comes much nearer to the ancient Church than does the Roman one, especially from her retaining the Invocation of the Holy Spirit after the words of Institution, and thereby rendering it impossible for any but theologians to fall into the error of supposing that the consecration consisted in the historical repetition of the words of Institution instead of the prayer. She has, moreover, in spite of the predominance of the sacerdotal and vicarious element, so far faithfully maintained the principle that this solemnity is an act of the congregation, that she celebrates it in the language of the congregation; whereas the Roman Church has forced her Latin on all the western nations.

Lastly, also, the mention of the departed adheres closer to

the spirit of the ancient Church; and masses for the dead, in the sense of the Roman Church, are unknown to her.

But, in the fifth century, it had ceased to be the custom for the congregation, when assembled for service, to receive the Communion; and the real oblation had ceased with it. The latter had now become, instead of a symbol of the internal sacrifice, a simulacrum of a symbol; consequently, a symbol of the offering of the elements by the people, which had disappeared or fallen into the background; consequently, of the body and blood of Christ also; and, consequently, of his propitiatory death: consequently, of the historical propitiatory sacrifice, not of the actual thank-offering of the communicating congregation. The Greek Church knows nothing of the dogma of Transubstantiation; but the Liturgy, and the whole Communion Service, may produce, upon the mind of a person who approaches them with that preconceived opinion, the impression that it originated in the same view.

The Liturgy of the Greek Church is just as stiff and dead as the Roman is, and considerably longer besides. The Roman, when compared with the Greek and even the Ambrosian and Gallican rituals, appears to have been compiled from forms which had become obscure and unintelligible. Her canon was, also, in reality fixed much later in the fifth century, and definitively at the end of the sixth; and, of all the Western Churches, deviates the most from the original character. The real Consecration Prayer is omitted, and, on the other hand, the words of Institution are brought into a prominence entirely foreign to the sense of the ancient Church. It is true that the canon recognizes the character of the Celebration as an offering of praise and thanksgiving, but there is little praise and no thanksgiving. Great stress, on the other hand, is laid upon such forms as gradually drew off the consciousness of the Church from the People to the Elements, from the Thank-offering of the believers to the repetition of the Sacrifice of Atonement. Thus, also, the canon still implies the Communion of the congregation; but it had already become more of a formality, and since that time has grown into a mere form. The congregation never communicates at the Lord's Supper, but after the Communion Service is over, although the

words of Gregory's canon require the contrary; and it is the same in the Greek Church. The whole celebration of the Roman mass is the act of the priest, who sacrifices the Lord's body, and thereby repeats the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ; not as a custom which is misunderstood, or as a false interpretation of the words of the Liturgy, but as a doctrine.

Scholasticism has erected into dogma that perversion of the fundamental idea of sacrifice and priesthood, which had sprung up unnoticed out of the change of custom. It has established the displacement of the centre of consciousness as the real exclusive consciousness of the Church, out of which grew the Masses for the Dead, Purgatory, Indulgences, and all their cognate abuses, elevated into doctrines. This formative process is a development, connected in all its parts: but this connexion is that of a development which leads down, pathologically, from life to death; from the spirit to the misinterpreted letter; from essence to external form.

The first problem, then, was to restore the real sacrifice: the sacrifice of self, vowed by the worshippers in thankful love. The second problem was to restore the equilibrium between service and practice; ritualism and reality; vow of sacrifice and a domestic, social, and political life of real sacrifice. Did the Reformation solve the first problem? Did the Christian States understand the second? We have here to answer the first question.

V. *The Service of the Reformed Churches.*

When the Reformation led to the restoration of the Christian worship on the basis of the Evangelical and Apostolical institutions, and when the service was consequently again performed in the language spoken by the people, the Lutheran Churches adopted, as a basis to be reformed, the Latin Mass; whereas Calvin regulated his services upon a system of abstract notions. The former were carried, against their will, into the conventionalism and errors of the Roman Church; and the scholasticising philo-

sophy of Luther in his later period, and of the Lutheranizers, as to the elements, is based upon that medieval misunderstanding. Calvin, on the other hand, substituted for the historical form a Celto-Romanic abstraction. Thus the idea of sacrifice, as held by the ancient Church, the most important thought and divine work of Apostolical Christianity, did not come to new birth in either branch of the Reformed Churches. The ceremony retained its dignity in both, by virtue of the inward power of the Evangelical faith, and the strength of the ethic thought, as well as by the efficacy of the momentous act of redemption by Christ, on which the solemnity rests. In the Lutheran Church, the Spirit found an expression for the internal sacrifice in inspired hymns; whereas the Calvinists, under the influence of Bibliolatry, made the spirit of the Old Testament, as poured out in the Psalms, the expression of their praise and thankful worship in Christ, made the morning star the light of noon. In both Churches, however, the sermon, the doctrinal element, predominated so beyond all proportion, that common prayer, as the act of the congregation, the popular element in the Church of the people, almost entirely disappeared.

The old conventionalism naturally died gradually away, but unfortunately only after the Protestants had made a fatal controversy about it among themselves, and had surrendered their interests, which were those of faith and of personal and political liberty, into the hands of the aggressive Papacy. The predominating didactic element, however, destroyed the Service, inasmuch as it made it tedious, so that it gradually appeared in the eyes of the upper classes as useless for them, unless rendered attractive by a display of rhetorical eloquence. The ceremony of the Lord's Supper stood as a ruin, kept up solely by the moral earnestness and internal efficacy of the religious consciousness of the worshippers. The historical idea of the Ecclesiastical year was set aside at the very outset by the Reformers, because they found it obscured by its connexion with the worship of Saints, and there was not reconstructive spirit enough in the age to restore it. By the Lutherans it was adopted, but merely as a tradition.

The English Church, in her Articles, started from Calvin's

point of view; but her doctrinal theology was never so developed as to attract any attention in Europe: in her liturgical reformation she adopted the Lutheran method. The political instinct of the people, however, seized hold of the idea inherent in the old forms, that the service is an act of the congregation. The Church of England restored the activity of which the medieval choir had deprived the people, and called upon them to speak, when they were unable to sing. It was only in cathedrals and abbeys that choral singing was retained, and the choristers sang what the people understood and had before them. Yet, as this liturgical restoration could not proceed from a leading reconstructive idea, and left no space for the action of the free element, it was neither organic nor catholic. Still less, in spite of the auspicious commencement, was the development an organic and catholic one. The service became more and more overcharged with peculiar, and in part wholly accidental, accumulations and repetitions. Nevertheless, as this Liturgy is the only product of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries deserving of any notice, and as it has attained, owing to its dignified character, and the world-wide dominion of England, an unrivalled position and influence, it must be the centre of the reflex of the liturgical state of the Protestant Churches in the mirror of the ancient Church.

In so doing, we meet at once with a very serious loss in the natural elements of Christian devotion. The ancient Church recognizes three kinds of common prayer: silent prayer, free prayer, and here and there short forms sanctioned by custom, watchwords, as it were, either for the minister alone, or for the clergy and the people jointly. The English Liturgy admits neither silent prayer nor free utterance in the service; the result of which is, that the two most spiritual forms, which are the natural complements of formularized prayer and exhortation, are excluded; and it is only in very rare exceptions that a choice is given between two formularies directed to the same object. The solemn pause in the service of ordination, immediately before the Veni Creator, is the only instance of that silent prayer which, in the ancient Church, is presupposed by every Collect, as the very name of Collect proves.

The ancient Church recognizes, moreover, together with the Psalms of the Old Testament, of which she made a free use, the psalms and hymns of the New Covenant, as the highest and most natural expression of the inspiration of the congregation. The English Church does not introduce into her service, ecclesiastically, as a part of the Liturgy, any sacred Christian hymns whatever. Translations of psalms in rhyme can never be anything but a good thing spoiled. The Psalms themselves she uses in succession, two or three, even four, without any interruption except by the *Gloria Patri*. Such a use is contrary to the wise canon of Laodicea, of the year 365 (Bingham, xiii. 5. 7.), and, what is more, contrary to the principle of the service. But the whole idea of singing every month the hundred and fifty psalms, divided between the morning and evening services of the thirty or thirty-one days, is unspiritual. It is not adopted on principle, but simply taken from the existing practice of the clergy. At the bottom of this practice lies that unintellectual view, which, in barbarous ignorance of their origin, considers the Psalms as a collection made (by king David, of course) for the service of the Church; whereas they state themselves to be five collections of ancient national and private hymns, destined only exceptionally for the Church service, hymns of all epochs, and from the days of Moses and David (whose songs are said to end with the 42nd Psalm) down to those of Ezra. The only hymns which were composed strictly for the Temple service are, with some few exceptions, those which date from after the Captivity. Now, if the reason of reading them so frequently during the service were, that they are a part of Scripture, not a word could be said against such a use of the whole Book of Psalms, especially if its contents and purport were properly explained to the people. But the singing of the congregation is meant to be the expression of the most inward feeling, the very feeling of adoration: and who will maintain that the Psalms, which were not originally composed for that purpose, are all of them adapted to being sung by a Christian congregation in the act of worship, simply because they are found in the Book of Psalms? Their repetition every month, moreover, creates a uniformity which can be only

tolerable from the force of habit, or the Roman idea of the *opus operatum*. Even the Greek and Roman Churches make no such call upon their congregations.

The Roman Church had, moreover, lost in the dark ages the antiphonal recitation, which the organism of the Psalms requires, every verse being divided into two hemistichs, which correspond to each other. This was changed into chanting by verses, a method purely arbitrary and spiritless, and, it may be said, contrary to Scripture; so that the second verse is considered as answering to the first (with which it is in no organic connexion), the fourth to the third, and so on. This defect has likewise been retained in the English Liturgy. Nor has another practice of the early Church, and of the Jews, been resorted to, that of the people repeating a striking hemistich, which expresses the leading thought of the whole composition; as, for instance, in the 118th Psalm (which Christ sang with the disciples after the last supper), the words, "His mercy endureth for ever."

The ancient Church had evidently a great variety in her Sunday service, which was sustained and held together by the unity of the type. The idea of the ecclesiastical year was to make the solar year the mirror of the revelation of God in the history of the world, of which the life of Christ formed the central point. Already in the ante-Nicene period this idea was in some degree sketched out, and appears very strongly marked in Hippolytus' lists of lessons in his Paschal Cycle. Round that festival, and therefore round the vernal equinox, the whole year is ranged: backwards, the celebration of the death and sufferings of Christ, the Epiphany, and Christmas; forward, the feast of Pentecost, as being the epoch of the descent of the Spirit and inauguration of the Church. The Church in later times developed this idea, not organically and clearly, it is true, but yet significantly, by means of the Sunday Scripture-readings appropriated to the different festivals and seasons, and the selection of psalms, and verses of psalms, intermixed with proper hymns and odes. The English Church has adopted the ecclesiastical year, expunging, indeed, every thing which had any reference to the worship of saints, but

omitting likewise every form expressing the peculiar character of the season of the ecclesiastical year, with the exception of some few appropriate portions of Scripture for the Sundays in Advent and the fast-days. The cycle of Bible-reading adopted by her, according to which the Old Testament (with a few omissions, and including the Apocrypha) is to be read completely through once every year, and the New, without any exception, three times, shows little regard for the ecclesiastical year and for the requirements of an intellectual and connected system of reading. Among the liturgical products of the medieval Church of Rome, the ordinances for the Holy Week, concluding with Easter, occupy in every respect the first rank. They have even some very ancient elements in them. But in the English Liturgy the uniformity of the service is here only very slightly broken through: the ancient forms are thrown away, and the opportunity of making the people respond to the recital of the Passion, by appropriate verses of psalms and hymns inserted at the end of every section, is not thought of.

The morning and evening services suffer so much the more from this dangerous uniformity, because, as already remarked, the elements of silent and free prayer are excluded from them. It is customary, moreover, to combine, on Sundays, the Morning Prayer with the detailed and lengthened Litany (a most beautiful and impressive prayer in itself), and both of them with the Communion service: that is to say, to make three ordinances, which are entirely distinct in themselves, into one, having no organic connexion, and abounding in repetitions.

The ancient Church had not, in the age of Hippolytus, admitted into the general service itself that Creed which was professed by candidates for baptism. This was done, however, by the Church of the succeeding centuries. The English Church uses that Creed on all occasions at morning and evening service, immediately after the reading of the New Testament, as a congregational act, the officiating minister leading, and the congregation repeating after him each separate sentence of it. On the three great festivals, and the festivals of the Apostles, the formulary of the later Trinitarian schoolmen, commonly, that is, falsely, called by the name of Athanasius, is substi-

tuted; a form never known in the East, and in the West only introduced into the choral morning service intended exclusively for the clergy. It is certainly in every respect infinitely less adapted to be recited by the whole congregation than the Nicene Creed. In the present Liturgy, the morning and evening services commence with a fixed form of confession, composed by Bucer, in itself very dignified, but too stiff, and, with the exception of a choice in the introductory sentences, uniform throughout; whereas the old Introit (although itself the wreck of an ancient rite, and the simulacrum of the Entrance of the Gospel) offered a variety of words and of thought. The service of confession is followed by the reading of the Psalms, preceded by two responsive sentences. The Lord's Prayer (with which the first book, according to medieval custom, awkwardly commenced) forms the connecting link between the act of confession and the psalmody.

The most vital element which the English Church (as early as 1549) has retained in this daily service is the old responsive sentences, repeated alternately by the priest and congregation after the Creed. They constitute a short intercessory prayer comprised in collects, the greater part of which is also old. These collects are a genuine Roman form, which suits particularly the turn of the English mind.

The Liturgy, as a whole, is dignified throughout, although it cannot be pronounced to be organic in itself, nor adapted for general use in Christendom, still less for domestic use. We must, however, from our point of view, consider the fact, that a Book of Common Prayer has become a national institution, as more important than all defects, and even all excellencies, of detail. It is of all Church ordinances, since the Reformation, the most important. It was a great and a blessed thought, this placing in the hands of a Christian nation a book impressing evangelical truths, not by abstract theological formulas, but by an act of worship and edification, and in language intelligible to the congregation. Such a book alone was capable of becoming a Church- and House-Book, and such it has become. It is in itself as valuable as the Text-Book of the ancient Church, the fragments of which we have endeavoured to restore,

and in many points infinitely superior to it; although, alas! less free, and breathing less of faith in that Christian Spirit which inspires the praying or teaching speaker. No Church in Christendom has yet carried out those liturgical ideas with the same dignity and completeness. The German Churches have, to this day, produced only clerical liturgies and regulations, and even the liturgical reform of Frederic William the Third has not gone beyond that. The Order of Prayers (Agenda) is a book for the clergy, and placed only in their hands. The Hymn-books, as well as almost everything that is good since the time of Luther, the German congregations have been obliged to work out for themselves, amid bloody struggles, with all the disadvantages of isolation, and mostly under despotic forms of government.

The most important portion of the great historical work of the English Church, however, still remains to be noticed, the Sunday Communion Service. She has here, from the very beginning, struck out a deep thought, and undertaken the solution of one of the greatest problems of the Reformation. It is from this elevated point of view, that we must consider the history of the Communion Service in particular, as a prominent part in a universal history of the human mind during the last three centuries. It is not merely that the Liturgy of the Communion is important, on account of its very close connexion with the political and civil wars of the seventeenth century, and because it has also since that time led to the most momentous theological controversies and schisms in the Church. Nor does its chief importance consist even in this, that it contains the most valuable ore of original English theology; nor in the fact, that the Book of Common Prayer and the Communion Service in particular, its most intellectual part and its most blessed, has done as much towards uniting the antagonistic elements in the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, as the dogmatic controversial writings, formulas of concord, and attempts at union projected by the theologians of the Continent, have done to divide the two Confessions, and to perpetuate their scholastic disputes. Its highest importance consists in this, that the Church of England has attacked, with seriousness and piety,

what has been to this hour one of the two great problems of the Reformation. By this we mean the restoration of the real Christian idea of sacrifice in its entire ethical and speculative significance, and its realization in its true domain. For it is only by both common prayer and Christian life being formed into an organic congregational action, that an understanding can be brought about between the contending parties, and the hope indulged of a living progressive development of Christianity and of Christian civilization throughout Europe and through the world. We shall, therefore, have to examine that grand national undertaking more closely in the reflex of our picture, and the rather because, although many meritorious works upon the subject of the English Liturgy (Note D.) exist, its history has not yet been written from a general point of view.

1. *The First Communion-Book of Edward VI.*

This work of Cranmer, Ridley, and their friends, as Royal Commissioners, presents the following order. The preparatory service begins with the ancient Introduction, or Introit: instead of single verses of Psalms, a whole Psalm was to be sung; then the old Kyrie Eleison (Lord have mercy upon us), with the Gloria (the old Morning Hymn after the Latin form). The Epistle and Gospel are preceded, according to the Roman custom, by the Collect for the day, after which one for the King is inserted, followed by the Nicene Creed (not used at Rome before 1014). After the sermon or homily follows an Exhortation to the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, now about to be celebrated. The minister is instructed to use it only when the sermon had not anticipated it. This Exhortation, which begins with the words,

> "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the Holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, must consider . . . ."

ends with an injunction to thankful self-sacrifice, as the proper sacrifice of Christians:

"To Him (Christ) therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give, as we are most bounden, continual thanks, submitting ourselves wholly to His holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve Him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life."

If there be no communicants, instead of this exhortation another is appointed to be read, in which notice is given that the Lord's Supper will be celebrated on the following Sunday or Holiday, and the congregation are invited to partake of it.

Immediately after the sermon, or after one of these exhortations has been read, the Offertory begins, accompanied by a collection for the poor. While this is going on, one or more sentences from the Bible, which enjoin charity or almsgiving, are read or sung. After this the non-communicants withdraw: the communicants take their places in the choir. Here, then, commences the real Communion Service. The parts of it are as follows:

I. The Preface, with the "Holy, Holy, Holy" (out of the Latin Missal).

II. The general Intercessory Prayer: "Almighty and everlasting God, who by Thy Holy Apostle hast taught us . . . ."

Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church: essentially the same as the present one, but with the following remarkable words added at the end, referring to the dead:

"We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace. Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace; and that at the day of the general resurrection we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son, may altogether be set on His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate."

This is a remarkable attempt to reform the medieval intercessory Prayer for the Dead on an evangelical basis. It bears a close resemblance to the corresponding prayer of the third century in the Church of Alexandria, which I have restored in my Reliquiæ Liturgicæ.

III. Consecration Prayer (Consecration of the Elements immediately before the words of Institution): "O God, Heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercy didst give . . . ."

"Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee, and *with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy Gifts and Creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ,* who in the same night," &c. (during the utterance of which words the Priest takes the bread and cup in his hands).

IV. Sacrificial Prayer (Oblation) as continuation:

"Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father . . . we make here before Thy Divine Majesty *with these Thy Holy gifts the memorial* which Thy Son hath willed us to make . . . . entirely desiring Thy fatherly goodness mercifully *to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,* most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that . . . we may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. *And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourself, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee:* humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion *may . . . . be made one body with Thy Son Jesus Christ, that He may dwell in them and they in Him.* Amen."

V. The Lord's Prayer. "As our Lord and Saviour hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say: Our Father," &c. (without the Doxology).

VI. The act of Confession: Salutation of Peace. Introductory sentences by the Choir. Thanksgiving for Christ's Sin-Offering. Exhortation to Confession of Sins. Absolution. Sentences from the Gospel inviting to the Communion.

VII. Concluding Collect before administering the Elements:

"We do not presume to come to this Thy table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We be not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table. But Thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy: Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood, in these holy mysteries, that we may continually dwell in Him, and He in us, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood. Amen."

VIII. Administration of the Lord's Supper, after the priest has first received it himself, in both kinds.

We remark that the authors, while carefully omitting everything opposed to the pure doctrine, show a scrupulous anxiety not to lose any one of the elements or forms of the ancient Church which might be retained. The prayer in which the dead are mentioned is still a prayer *for* the dead, but in the sense of the Hippolytan age, and with an attempt at an evangelical development. In the Consecration Prayer the Liturgy has not yet been able to free itself entirely from the Elements. The Blessing through the Spirit and the Word (namely, through the words of Institution) is invoked upon the prayer, not upon the congregation; whereas the Apostolical Church prayed originally for the blessing only upon the congregation, to which subsequently was added a blessing for the gifts; just as in baptism the Spirit was invoked to sanctify the water for the sanctification of the Catechumens. The idea of Consecration, however, was not merely retained as a prayer, in contradistinction to the erroneous notion of the Lutheran Church, but a really spiritual sacrificial prayer was added, which is, to this hour, the best and most complete ecclesiastical expression of the true Christian sacrifice of Self. This prayer is the most important part of the whole Liturgy. Its contents are derived directly from the fundamental thought of the Reformation. It is a realization of the doctrine of Justification in the form of a vow, as the type of the sacrifice of love in the life of the Christian. The conception is as appropriate as it is dignified. Our former remarks have shown how such a thought alone explains the act of the earliest Church, and the consciousness of the earliest Fathers in respect to it. No one who enters into the whole spirit of Palmer's Church views can wonder that that learned man should not have acknowledged this originality; indeed, he has thrown that most important prayer rather into the back-ground, because he does not find a warrant for it in ancient rituals. This is very natural. For all he aims at is to find what he thinks canonical authority for the formularies and articles of his own Church in the post-Nicene, and, if possible, in that of the middle ages. He refers the English formularies to those real or supposed precedents, which are, in his opinion, models. Everything new, however

Christian and Scriptural, he considers as a deviation, which he laments as a defect, and thinks himself bound to justify, or rather to excuse, although he usually denies that there is any. Such a proceeding seems unwarranted either by historical or philosophical criticism. It is painful, however, to find the following remark in a German critic like Daniel, who in other places does not conceal his noble indignation at Palmer's proceeding. When offering a judgment upon the Collect of Thanksgiving in the present Prayer-book, which is borrowed from this passage, he says that its contents (*singula*) are taken from the private prayer of the priest in the Roman mass after the congregation are dismissed: "Placeat, sancta Trinitas, obsequium servitutis meæ, et præsta ut sacrificium quod oculis tuæ majestatis indignus obtuli, tibi sit acceptabile, mihique et omnibus pro quibus illud obtuli sit, te miserante, propitiabile."

It is needless to remark, that the place assigned in this older Liturgy of King Edward to that expression of sacrifice is in every respect the correct one. This is the place for the highest realization of the act of sacrifice announced by the Preface. The sacrifice immediately precedes the Communion, the Lord's Prayer forming the connecting link: for the Lord's Supper is the holy act of faith which seals the renewed vow of thankful love.

We may, on the other hand, entertain a doubt whether the position assigned to the act of confession, at the head of the real Communion, is the proper one. The ancient Church took care not to disturb the expression of highest thankfulness and praise by exhortation to repentance, and by the whole act of confession. This act constituted, in one form or other, a portion of the Preparatory Service: a later custom of the Lutheran Church connects it directly with the sermon. If we choose, however, to consider it as a necessary preparation for partaking of the Lord's Supper, an especial preparatory service of confession would seem better suited to that purpose. In this place it comes too late for an introductory internal self-examination, and is disturbing as a liturgical form.

This blessed work of the two martyrs of the Gospel was the first step taken by the English Church to make the Service,

instead of an *opus operatum* of the clergy, once more the act of the congregation, and to establish upon it the Christian Sacrifice stripped of its Levitical disguise.

It did not, however, fully satisfy the feelings of Protestants, who by persecution and bitter controversy were excited to opposition and distrust, and who were so deeply offended with some too medieval forms and expressions which were still retained, that they rejected and repudiated them as suspicious, even in such a purified form.

2. *The Second Book of Edward VI.*, 1552.

Thus, then, under the advice of the German Bucer (who composed the Introduction to the daily Morning and Evening Services), and of the Florentine Peter Martyr, the Book of Common Prayer was re-written, as early as in 1552; and with it, the Order of the Communion in the first book set aside. This reconstruction is very important, and, together with the not very considerable alterations made in 1559 and 1604, and especially at the Restoration (1662), forms the present English Liturgy. We shall give a complete analysis of it when we arrive at the period of 1662.

In the Second Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI., according to the precedent of the Genevan Church, the decalogue is placed at the head of the Communion Service, and a long and tedious, because too frequent, didactic reading is very sensibly converted into a congregational act by the short response of the people, in the form of a prayer, after each commandment. In the Intercessory Prayer the petition for the dead is omitted, and a Thanksgiving substituted for it. In like manner, the medieval consecration of the elements is changed into a petition for a blessing on the communicants. All these are palpable improvements. But from a dread of a false view of Sacrifice creeping in, some most beautiful, most important, and most universal portions of the ancient Communion Service are here omitted, and the idea of the Christian Sacrifice is simply expressed as a voluntary appendix, namely, as a collect, following

the Communion (post-communio), which may be used instead of the ordinary collect of Thanksgiving borrowed from the Latin Ritual. And so strange are the changes in the human mind upon religious subjects, so long as the matter is not brought fully home to the general Christian feeling, that this second collect, at that time an ultra-Protestant one (because it had no reference to sacrifice), has again become, in our time, the favourite collect of those who estimate the value of a liturgical form by its being found in the Rituals of the medieval Church.

3. *Laud's Communion Liturgy for Scotland.*

The reconstruction of the Liturgy in a Protestant sense was very far from satisfying the Presbyterian party among the clergy. As early as the time of James I., the reaction which began to show its face in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, and which was secretly encouraged by her, was publicly avowed, and strove openly for the mastery, under the favour of a monarch equally narrow-minded as a composer of a Liturgy, as he was pitiful as a king. James I., who wished, for political reasons, to make Scotland episcopal, had planned the introduction of the English Liturgy into that country. Laud, however, and his friends in Scotland, thought they could make use of this scheme to further their views of bringing the Scottish Liturgy back to the medieval, by means of the English. Such was the origin, after long secret preparation, of the Communion Liturgy which was intended for Scotland, and which, in 1637, Charles I., by force of the royal prerogative, "after hearing the clergy," endeavoured to force upon the people. It is well known that it was the cause of the outbreak, and one of the causes of the rebellion which brought the archbishop, and afterwads the king himself, to the scaffold. As it forms the basis of the present Communion Liturgy of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and, in part, of that of the United States, and as it is the expression of an ecclesiastical view which now again strives for the ascendancy, we subjoin a complete synopsis of its contents from the unaltered original version.

After the Commandments (which were left untouched), the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, the Nicene Creed, and the Sermon, the real Communion Service followed.

A. The Offertory, reconstructed into a symbolical sacrificial office. It begins with sacrificial sentences: from the Sacrifice of Abel (Gen. xiv. 3—5.); from the Levitical sacrifice (Ex. xxv. 2.; Numb. xvi. 16.); from David's Thanksgiving at the consecration of the gifts for the building of the Temple (1 Chron. xxix. 10, 11, 12. 14. 17.; the words of ver. 14. became liturgical at an early period, and are here applied with spirited freedom: "Of Thine own do we give unto Thee"); closing with the verse of Psalm xcvi. 8.: "Ascribe to the Lord the honour due unto His name: bring presents, and come into His courts."

The sentences applying to almsgiving in the English Liturgy (see above, I.) then follow immediately after these sacrificial sentences.

When these are ended, the priest takes into his hands the basin, which is presented to him, containing the alms, places it upon the altar, and orders the bread and wine for the Communion.

B. General Intercessory Prayer (Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church Militant here on earth, see above, II.). Instead of the Prayer for the Dead, the following is here introduced:

"And we also bless Thy holy name for all those Thy servants who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours. And we yield unto Thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all Thy saints who have been the choice vessels of Thy grace, and the lights of the world, in their several generations: Most humbly beseeching Thee that we may have grace to follow the example of their stedfastness in Thy faith, and obedience to Thy holy commandments, that, at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they," &c. (as above).

C. After the Intercessory Prayer, an exhortation is enjoined to be read from time to time, either inviting communicants to the Lord's Supper, or warning them against the unworthy receiving of it, revisions of the formularies of the First Book of Edward VI. There is prescribed, however, for every holiday (after the non-communicants have withdrawn), an Admonition to the worthy receiving of the Lord's Supper: "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come . . . ." (as in both the Books of Edward VI.).

D. Acts of Confession, Invitation, Creed, Absolution, Sentences (ac-

cording to the form in the Second Book of Edward VI., see above, VII.).

E. Preface with "Holy, Holy, Holy" (see above, I.).

F. Consecration Prayer (see above, III.), an intermediate form between the First and Second Books of Edward VI.: "Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, which of Thy tender mercies . . . . Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee; and of Thy Almighty goodness *vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son;* so that we, receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of the same His most precious body and blood, who in the night," &c.

G. Prayer of Oblation: "Wherefore, O Lord our Heavenly Father," &c., word for word as in the First Book (see above, IV.); only that in the offering of the Oblation, after the words, "with these Thy Holy Gifts," the following are added: "*which we now offer unto Thee.*"

H. The Lord's Prayer (see above, V.).

I. Concluding Prayer: "We do not presume," &c. (see above VII.).

It is obvious that the older form is deliberately adopted, and here and there rendered more complete; in the Offertory, for instance; but every thing in a reactionary sense. Instead of expressing more strongly the spiritual sacrifice, for that was the problem which the sixteenth century undertook, but did not entirely succeed in solving, the Levitical one, on the contrary, is here, and in the Consecration and Oblation, more strongly marked; with a decided tendency towards the medieval idea of the eucharistic sacrifice, that is to say, the sacrifice in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Here also the blessing "through the Word and the Spirit" is prayed for; so that the power of the Word is brought more prominently forward: and it cannot be denied that by the "Word" we are not to understand the creative Word of God, the Word in the highest sense, but the words of Institution: "This is my body." By this the expression of self-sacrifice, which is retained here from the First Book of Edward VI., is entirely thrown into the background: it is a reaction to Levitical forms, under the delusion or pretext of an Apostolical restoration.

The Protestant feeling of the people against Laud's Liturgy was therefore a very correct one, and a real voice of God. There was concealed behind the Liturgical archaism a theology which, if carried out consistently, must have led back to Romanism. There was besides a sacerdotal pretension, which made the priest who was qualified by episcopal succession and episcopal consecration (as the exclusive vehicle of sacramental grace which is necessary to salvation) to be the lord of the conscience and the dispenser of salvation. As regards the learning of Laud, and his older and more modern spiritual brethren, it is exactly on a footing with his knowledge of Christian architecture, by virtue of which he enjoined that the altar should be everywhere placed at the end of the apse (the position of the old cathedra) in honour of antiquity and tradition. It is a spiritless knowledge of medieval traditions arbitrarily preferred to really ancient Christianity, and a conventional scholasticism irreconcilable with historical and philosophical criticism. The most innocent form is a poor provincial antiquarianism, the only effect of which can be to disturb the conscience, and impede the light of a living future.

4. *The present established Communion Service of the Church of England*, 1559, 1604, *and* 1662.

After the points of contrast between the old and new Liturgies, as well as between such formularies and free prayer and speech, had been, in the course of the seventeenth century, variously combated by both parties, for the most part with one-sided arguments, but with great zeal and animosity, the National Liturgy took its present form, in its essential points, at the Restoration (1662), after the Savoy Conference, the results of which were unsatisfactory. It subsequently was to undergo a final revision under William III. in 1689; but the proposals of the Royal Commissioners not receiving the assent of Convocation, they were accordingly dropped. This was the last attempt at a definitive settlement of the Liturgy.

The order, compared with the more ancient, is as follows. After the Sermon, in conformity with the natural interpretation of the rubric, the Offertory always follows: sentences which enjoin charity and almsgiving being read during the collection of alms.

But if there be no communicants, it is doubtful whether the General Prayer of the Church is not to be omitted. The rubric is very ambiguous, and the ordinary practice, at least of the last 150 years, is so strongly in favour of that interpretation, that even the Offertory is left out when there are no communicants, the Service concluding with the Sermon and one of the Collects annexed, expressive of the blessing attached to the hearing of the Word of God. If notice is to be given for the following Sunday of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, it is to be done at that time by means of an exhortation borrowed entirely from the earlier Liturgy.

But the omission of the Offertory, so clearly prescribed, proves that this custom is the natural, but very much to be regretted, consequence of the Morning Service having been made practically (with the Liturgy) the first part of the Communion Service. People found the Service too long, and thus mutilated the most important concluding part. By this practice the ordinary Sunday Service is deprived of the Act of Petition and Thanksgiving, for which the congregation was to be "built up" by the foregoing Service. The ordinary Service, without Communion, is already shorn of the Preface, which, nevertheless, has nothing whatever to do with the Communion as such, being the introduction to the Act of Thanksgiving. But by that custom it loses the act of Prayer itself, of which the Offertory was to be only the symbol. The General Church Prayer is indeed prescribed for this part of the Service in all the ordinances, from the earliest down to those of the Protestant Churches, with the single exception of the Prussian Liturgy of 1821. Thus the whole organization of the Service, typically fixed from the most primitive times, would be destroyed if that interpretation were the true one. It is impossible to ascribe such thoughtlessness to the framers of the Liturgy. Besides, it is asserted, that in some cathedrals and university chapels the

custom of saying that General Prayer with the Offertory every Sunday has always been maintained, and it is a fact that in the Chapel Royal at St. James's both have been constantly used; and this seems to decide the question against the ordinary practice.

In that beautiful General Intercessory Prayer (Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth) which begins with the words,

> "Almighty and everliving God, who by Thy Holy Apostle hast taught . . . ."

the mention of those who have departed in faith, which was altogether omitted in 1552, is restored, but without any Intercession, perfectly free from the possibility of misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Its dignified words are as follows:

> "And we also bless Thy holy name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear: beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate."

If we turn to the Gospel and the ancient Church, we shall see clearly that this prayer might have been strengthened without any danger, and with considerable effect, by adding the thought now embodied in a collect of the Funeral Service, after the Thanksgiving for the blessed departure of a deceased brother:

> "Beseeching Thee that it may please Thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thy elect, and to hasten Thy kingdom. . . . ."

The Act of Confession corresponding essentially with No. VI. of the earlier Service.

The Preface, with the "Holy;" its position being altered here from No. I. in the earlier Service.

Concluding Prayer before the Consecration ("We do not presume," &c.): word for word, the concluding Prayer, No.

VII. of the older Version, before the distribution of the elements.

Consecration Prayer (see above, III.). Here, in the principal passage, the petition for blessing is very properly transferred altogether from the elements to the communicants, and the equivocal words "with Thy Holy Spirit and Word" are also omitted:

"Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and grant *that we*, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His most blessed body and blood, who in the same night," &c. &c.

After this the clergy receive the sacrament and administer it to the congregation.

If we hold this Service up to the mirror of the ancient Church, it is impossible not to recognize its great Christian wisdom, both in that part of it which is borrowed from the ancient Church, and that which is new. It is equally impossible, however, to disguise from ourselves the fact that the problem which offered itself to the consideration of the Church in the sixteenth century is not solved. The organization of the ancient sacrifice is lost, and that adopted for the new sacrifice is less completely developed than it was in the Liturgy of 1549.

The history of the Communion Service, and of the Liturgy generally, ceases, as far as England is concerned, with the year 1662. But, when considered from a general Christian point of view, the development of this most remarkable, and, after the Bible, most widely circulated and most national book upon earth, has by no means ceased. The whole received a thorough reform in the Episcopal Church of the United States, which has found its way through the vast body of the New Continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Now this reform is, in the Communion Service, considerably influenced by the Communion Liturgy of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, which was drawn up after the middle of the last century. We therefore must consider first this remarkable phase of the history of that Liturgy.

5. *The present Communion Service of the Episcopal Church of Scotland.*

After the Scotch Liturgy imposed by Charles I. in 1636 had been developed by the influence of the Non-Jurors, after 1689, more and more according to the medieval type (evidence of which is found in the editions of 1724, 1743, and 1755, which I have before me), all at once there appears, in the edition of 1764, a second and more decided thorough revision of the Communion Service in the spirit of Laud. Those bishops who, after the expulsion of James II., refused to take the oath of allegiance to king William III. and his consort, put themselves as Non-Jurors at the head of a reaction, and their successors in Scotland had full liberty of action in a Sacerdotal Church abandoned by the nation. Just as Laud had used Scotland as a lever for the Catholicising reaction against the Protestantized Liturgy of 1552, so did that party make use of the Episcopal Church in Scotland against the confirmation and reinforcement of Protestant principles in 1689. That revision is to be considered as the last product of that spirit of the seventeenth century, which has in our days been re-awakened by a very considerable portion of the Anglican clergy. It starts from that mistaken idea of Sacrifice in the Communion, which we have pointed out as being a corruption of the Christian views of the first three centuries. But it merits consideration as an attempt carried out consistently, with great erudition and liturgical skill, albeit in a one-sided spirit, to solve a still unsettled problem. It was sanctioned in 1811 and 1838 for solemn occasions. The most important part of it, moreover, has been adopted in the Episcopal Church of the United States. Its peculiarity will be seen by the following comparison with Laud's Liturgy:

After the Sermon:

A. Admonition: "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the Holy Communion," &c. Out of the First Book of Edward I., where it may nevertheless be omitted by the clergyman (Laud, A.).

B. Offertory (compare Laud, B.: but much more developed). It

begins with the Invocation to Sacrifice: "Let us present our offerings to the Lord with reverence and godly fear, ..."

Then follow the Sacrificial Sentences from Laud.

The priest places upon the altar the basin with the collection which has been made in the meantime, during which he utters a thanksgiving to God, borrowed from the Prayer of David and the Greek Liturgies (to express the sacrifice of the Thanksgiving), and generally consisting of verses of Psalms:

"Blessed be Thou, O Lord God, for ever and ever: Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heavens and the earth is Thine: Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and Thou art exalted as head above all: both riches and honour come of Thee, *and of Thy own do we give unto Thee. Amen.*"

C. The Preface with "Holy . . ." (like Laud, E.).

D. The Consecration Prayer is exactly like those in Laud and First Edward VI., and the New English one, except that the whole passage in the middle about the Sacrifice is omitted, in which the old and new formularies differ. The beginning only is somewhat altered, out of fondness for the Greek models. Instead of "Almighty God, who of Thy tender mercy," &c., it says: "All glory be to Thee, Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, for that Thou, of Thy tender mercy," &c.

E. The Oblation with the Invocation agrees in its beginning and end with Laud G.; but in the middle the important passage of the old Consecration Prayer, transcribed above, is inserted, which was omitted in the new Consecration Prayer. The whole, therefore, runs thus:

"Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, . . . we . . . make here before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, *which we now offer unto Thee*, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make: having in remembrance His blessed passion. . . ."

"And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of Thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become" (here are omitted the words "*unto us*," which Laud retained,) "the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son. . ."

"And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to

accept this our sacrifice of praise and Thanksgiving, &c." (as above) . . . . *Amen.*

F. "Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church." (Exactly like Laud, C.)

G. The Lord's Prayer (Laud, H.).

H. Act of Confession (Laud, D.).

I. Concluding Collect (Laud, I.). The administration of the Sacrament follows.

So far, then, everything tended, by what appeared to some hierarchical politicians, and many pious, but weak-headed and half-learned priests, a conservative development, to bring back the service of the English people, in the "Free" Episcopal Church of Scotland, to the old Levitical Sacrifice. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was nothing more than a logical scholastic consequence of such a Liturgy. It is true that the service was still performed in the language of the people, and that the hierarchs inveighed against Rome. But this cannot alter the spirit of the Liturgy. It would be a delusion, were we to endeavour to explain this reaction, which is very important although it never obtained universal adoption, as based upon mere personal and transient motives and influences. Its origin lies much deeper. Neither does it consist merely in the hierarchical efforts to make use of the Liturgy in order to restore sacerdotal power. It consists essentially and permanently in this, that the problem of the Reformation, in this domain likewise, is not yet conclusively solved. The singular phenomenon, that exactly at the end of a hundred years this very same sacrificial portion of the Non-Jurors' Liturgy should be inserted, by the founders of the "Free" Episcopal Church in the United States, into what is otherwise, in many respects, a progressive step in the development of the English Liturgy, is a proof that the erroneous portion of the fundamental idea of elementary sacrifice can only be overcome and eradicated by the full recognition and expression of the true spiritual sacrifice. We must here not forget that the liturgical question in England was in 1662 carried by a violent reaction, and in 1689 dropped, but never solved.

6. *The Liturgy of the Episcopal Church of the United States*, 1789.

One of the distinguished heads of the Episcopal Church in the United States, the late bishop Seabury, had something of this feeling, when he and bishop White, and their friends, resolved upon a reform of their Church, both in constitution and in Liturgy, after the War of Independence.

That Liturgy, as definitively settled since 1789, is a very sparing, and not altogether free, though very important improvement upon the English one. The use of the Psalms is rendered more tolerable, by a selection made with the direct aim of expressing the feelings of worship of a Christian congregation. The great want of Christian hymns has been remedied by an ecclesiastical collection, which has gradually become considerable; as indeed it never should fail to form an integral part of the Church-Book. As to the Communion Liturgy, its most striking feature, particularly when we consider the political spirit of the United States, and the period in which that Liturgy was established, is a return to the older form of the English service, and an attempt to make a fusion of the First Book of Edward VI., and its hierarchical revision in Scotland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with the Second more decidedly Protestant one, and the improvements made in it in 1662 and proposed in 1689. The following comparative survey will illustrate the nature of this connexion.

In the preparatory portion of the Sunday Service, it must be mentioned to the credit of its compilers, that Christ's epitome of the commandments is added to the decalogue.

After the Sermon there follows:

The Offertory, unaltered.

The Prayer for all conditions of the Church militant.

When there is no Communion the Service ends here; if the Communion is to be administered the following Sunday, the clergyman may read the whole or part of one of the two formularies of exhortation borrowed from the English Liturgy.

The Act of Confession: precisely as in the English Liturgy.

The concluding Collect: the same.

The Consecration Prayer: the form of the present English Liturgy, omitting the above-cited passage, which contains the petition for blessing upon the communicants, instead of the old invocation of blessing on the elements. On the other hand there is a new addition of

The Oblation Prayer, out of the First Book of Edward VI. (see above, V.), with the insertion of the Invocation contained in the old Consecration Prayer as given above. In this the petition for the blessing on the elements is borrowed from the First Book, and the one for the blessing on the communicants from the Second. To this is annexed the spiritual Oblation Prayer, which, in the new English Liturgy, is transferred to the Post-Communio. The result of the patchwork is (with a little grammatical inaccuracy) the following remarkable prayer:

"Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, according to the institution of Thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy divine Majesty, with these Thy Holy gifts, which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance His blessed passion and precious death, His mighty resurrection and glorious ascension: rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same: and we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of Thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood. And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we, and all Thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee; humbly beseeching Thee, that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, be filled with Thy grace and heavenly bene-

The Oblation.

The Invocation.

diction, and made one body with Him, that He may dwell in them (us), and they (we) in Him. And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen."

Summary of the Results of the Protestant Measures for amending the Liturgy and restoring the Sacrifice.

If we cast our eyes, in the first place, on the English Church, she will strike us at once as being marked by two grand ideas, which render her conspicuous above all other Churches. The first of these we may express thus. Her object was to place in the hands of the people a national book of devotion, which should elevate the religious service from being the peculiar work and business of the clergy, into an object of the religious consciousness of the nation, and place the form of common worship out of the reach of the caprice of any individual minister. The second we may define thus. Her object was to restore the idea of the Christian Sacrifice, as being the highest spiritual act of the individual and congregation before God, and, with the sacrament, the fundamental idea of the whole religious worship.

These two ideas evidently have not been thoroughly carried out, and are far from having obtained complete success. The causes of this relative failure are partly internal, partly external, defects. We have recognized in the mirror of the ancient Church, that the English Liturgy is deficient in several elements, but especially in those of free and silent prayer. This want of freedom attaches to it in part from the condition out of which the Church then arose; in part from a certain degree of hesitation or indifference which is as characteristic of the English mind in ecclesiastical affairs, as it is foreign to it in political

concerns. But this internal explanation of that fact is not sufficient to account for the whole. Neither is it fully accounted for by bearing in mind the vast difficulties which stood in the way of a positive creation of a new constructive form in the sixteenth century. It is a great delusion, voluntary or involuntary, to treat the rubrics like passages in a law-book, and to speculate constantly upon the reason for exactly choosing such and such a word or formulary. No such systematic plan has ever existed, either in the German Lutheran, or the English reformed Liturgy; and single words must therefore be interpreted, when the expressions are ambiguous, historically; in particular by the fundamental ideas from which the fathers of the English Church started, and about which their own writings leave no question of doubt. The Church imposes dogmatical definitions, according to universally received principles, by articles of religion, which of course must be interpreted in their natural and historical sense. The Liturgy is made for devotion, and not for definitions; its aim is to reconcile and soften down contending abstractions, not to introduce surreptitiously condemned principles. The rubrics are vague and contradictory. Those fathers acted on one principle only, namely, that of excluding everything which did not harmonize with evangelical consciousness, and of retaining as much of the rest as possible. Here and there they unsuspectingly adopted the existing formularies, merely because they found them. The origin of the medieval service was at that time involved in obscurity. The Greek Liturgy was as good as unknown. Ignorance as to the idea and gradual corruption of the notion of Sacrifice in the service was general. From a reconstructive work of reformation, undertaken from such an imperfect point of view, a very satisfactory provisional result may be obtained, and as to details something permanently exemplary may arise. It cannot, however, be expected that the whole should be organic, and attain catholic (universal) excellence.

But all this, as we have said, only accounts for the imperfection of the first attempt, not for the want of a definitive development. We must here consider how, at a very early period, esp ci lly in England, Reformed ideas were tinged with the

feeling of opposition to everything medieval, which will account for many peculiarities in the Second Book of Edward VI. But, secondly (and this is the main point), we must remember that a catholicizing reaction very shortly afterwards arose, indeed as early as the time of Elizabeth. This reaction was essentially that of a hierarchical corporation, and opposed to the Evangelical feeling of the people. The organic development of the Liturgy is evidently repressed by the change which, in consequence of the preponderance of that element, gradually predominated in the whole religious consciousness of the nation, as far as it was connected with the Church. The national element grew eminently into an element of government; the National Church into a State Church. The Church feeling remained rather a clerical concern, than became a national one; in consequence of which the laity (or the whole nation except the clergy) were excluded from ecclesiastical councils and the whole internal life of the Church: an exclusion which, of course, reacted powerfully upon that apathy. The clergy, left to itself, felt and acted naturally as a prejudiced corporation; and, by this means, the feeling of the inward religious independence and liberty of the individual and of the people was weakened, and in a like degree all interest in liberty of thought and the love of progress. This observation bears especially upon the main point, the celebration of the Communion. The consciousness of the Christian Sacrifice necessarily manifests itself as a sacerdotal one, in the medieval sense, whenever the want of expressing it awakens in a dominant sacerdotal corporation, and not in a nation.

It appears futile to attempt to control that sacerdotal tendency by the veto of the governing powers of the State. Nor can the evil be remedied by the rejection of all idea of sacrifice, and by reducing the service to a cold formless act of the understanding. Such a dry naked worship is as far removed as possible from the "reasonable service" of the Apostles, and never can satisfy the religious feeling of the people for any length of time, but must tend rather to generate a dangerous enthusiasm or a hierarchical reaction: Methodism or Romanism.

Upon these grounds I think the *fact* may be explained, that the great movement of the sixteenth century, as it shows itself (with contradictory defects) in the two Books of Edward VI., loses, at the very outset of the spirit-killing seventeenth century, all progressive vitality in England; whereas the hierarchical tendency, which endeavoured to supersede the legal and national Liturgy, continues its reactionary attempts. The national spirit of the English people repulsed these attempts: but the forms of the national Liturgy became rigid before it had reached its organic perfection.

With all this, however, it must not be forgotten, that the English Church- and House-Book became and has remained at once the most widely circulated, and the most practically blessed book of devotion in the Christian world, and the only national one. With the exception of the Quakers, all Dissenters who speak the English language (even the Unitarians) retain a large portion, the Methodists almost the whole, without any alteration, of the contents of that Church-Book. The lamentable notion, that the service is essentially the sermon, has, by that means, been carefully guarded against by the English Church, as well as the spirit of theological quibbling which darkens the ancient, and the arbitrary license of the individual minister which disfigures the modern, German development. It must, at the same time, as a matter of justice, be admitted, that, comparatively speaking, free prayer and free preaching have been much discountenanced, and almost banished from the service as "enthusiasm," by the exclusive fixity of English ritualism.

As to the celebration of the Communion, the English rite is undoubtedly in every respect the most dignified and solemn. It exhibits also externally the idea of the brotherhood of the communicants, much more than the single successive Communion used in most Lutheran Churches. The chancel serves very appropriately as a means for uniting successively ten or twenty communicants during that sacred act.

The liturgical service of the Protestant Churches on the Continent has, in spite of their having retained some beautiful elements, particularly in the Lutheran congregations, remained

entirely without new and renovating ideas. But the sermon, as the testimony of the Spirit, hallowing and inspiring the speech in the congregation, has been dignifiedly, and in some respects grandly, developed. This naturally cannot be obtained without power and habit of meditation; as connected thought and meditation, again, cannot exist without thorough fundamental theological study and practice.

Upon the whole, then, we must say, that the Protestant Churches, from the very beginning, have nowhere succeeded in exhibiting religious worship as a sacrifice; although they have to a certain degree aimed at doing so. Their service is pure in its essentials, but wants an organic idea, as the centre of the sacred act of the Congregation; and, when there is no Communion, is without any deeper basis on which a new life of worship, and consequently a Church, can permanently be established in the world.

Hence, also, we may now form a more just estimate of the Catholicizing tendency which has unfortunately become so prominent in a certain school in England, whenever attention has been turned to the defects in the National Liturgy, and to the older forms of Oblation. The error consists solely in this, that they have capriciously apotheosized a later, and, besides, demonstrably misunderstood custom, which is in contradiction to the earlier one. This they would hardly have done, had they not loved the killing Form more than the life-giving Idea. This form, again, would not have been so unqualifiedly insisted on, had it not been a question of enthroning the authority of the priesthood, as such, whether from weakness of faith or out of love of sacerdotal dominion. It cannot, however, escape the notice of the historian, that this same hierarchical love of power exists also among those who idolize the letter of the present English Liturgy. The unprejudiced observer cannot fail to detect here also the struggle of every caste of the priesthood to make the form administered by themselves a holy life-giving thing in itself, and thereby to enhance the validity of their own sacerdotal prerogatives. Such a tendency may be a mark of great wisdom in a false religion. It is wholly contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, and therefore not conservative.

Instead of furthering, it impedes the progress of the kingdom of God, which advances only by the progressive triumph of the idea of the inward sacrifice of self for the brethren, out of thankful love to God. The ancient Church, into whose records we have searched, as well as the Gospel, cries aloud against such tendencies and against their necessary consequences.

III.

THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION.

The ancient Church may be considered as an Apostolical type and model in two particulars: the Idea of the spiritual Christian thank-offering, and the Ordering of Divine Service in the form of a common act of the minister and congregation. The later, that is, the post-Nicene, Greek Church, and the Roman Church also in some points, especially in her collects, offer much valuable material and many instructive hints to the investigator, who, with Christian freedom, follows up the thought of worship in the intervening fifteen centuries. But in so doing, the Idea must always be borne in mind, and the Form be kept subordinate to the Spirit. Thus the old collects were originally intended to sum up, collect, the silent prayers to which the people had been called; only at a later period they became independent forms. As to the collects which precede the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, they were intended to refer to the contents of these selections from Scripture. But indeed the Gregorian collect is only an appropriate one for the festivals, as a Christmas or Easter collect for instance. The Sunday Epistle and Gospel have very rarely any such connexion with the Sunday collect which precedes them, and the collect thus becomes, to a certain degree, a mere form. The only way, therefore, of at all carrying out the idea of the ancient Church would be, to insert, in place of the present collect, a particular Epistle collect, and a particular Gospel collect. In that case, they might be both used, or the one only of them which it seems desirable to make the more prominent. If, then, the Roman Church, in her use of collects, though not the inventress of the form (for it is borrowed from the Greek Church), be still eminently distinguished as a composer, she is without the element of prophetic lessons which we find preserved in the

African and Gallican Churches. The idea of such lessons, by the side of short passages of the Gospel history and Apostolical teaching, was to show throughout the ecclesiastical year the harmony between the Old and New Testaments. The prophetic lesson precedes the Epistle and Gospel both in the African and Gallican Liturgies. If, therefore, we apply that idea in a Scriptural sense, a selection of short passages of Scripture, one for the Epistle, and one for the Gospel of the day, consisting of striking passages from the books of the Prophets and verses of the Psalms, would seem the most appropriate form for showing the internal harmony of the spiritual elements of the Old and New Testaments, and for bringing before the mind of the congregation the real typical and prophetic character of the Prophets and Psalms. This the later Roman Church endeavoured to obtain by the verses of the Introit. It is clear that Hippolytus had also some such object in view in the indication of some Lessons from the Old Testament affixed to his Table of Easter.

The idea is evidently excellent: but the mode in which it was carried out in the ancient Church herself, we cannot vaunt as a model for imitation. She endeavours generally to demonstrate that harmony by bringing forward long passages of the Old Testament. These, however, generally either do not really apply to the object proposed, except by virtue of a wholly untenable interpretation, or they simply contain a few words of a kindred character which are lost in the context, or, at all events, obscured by it. The spiritual treasures of the Prophets and Psalms which really answer this purpose are very far from having been exhausted by the ancient Church, and are scarcely used at all by the early Protestant school, some liturgical compositions of the Book of Common Prayer excepted. What then becomes of the idolatry of ancient forms? If those English writers who urge the imperfect letter of the post-Nicene Church proposed it as a model of Christian wisdom and taste, their opinion might be very quietly discussed. But, as they bring it forward as sacred authority, we must first ask to what authority they refer? If to that of the primitive Church, they cannot maintain their position one moment, for the forms they

idolize are unknown to that ancient Church, and very often nothing but misunderstandings and wrecks of that primitive age. If they appeal to the authority of the Latin Church, they must first go to Rome to have a right to do so; if to that of the Church of England, they forget that this Church has, by using her Christian reforming liberty, overthrown the principle of idolatry both of Church authority and of ritualism. If, finally, they appeal to their own authority, let them give us their reasons, and enter frankly upon the ground of free discussion.

It is a very laudable feeling to appeal to Christian antiquity, if it be done subserviently to Scripture and to the Spirit. But whoever appeals to the forms and ordinances of the fifth and sixth or subsequent centuries ought to consider, that to accept a later development as a precedent implies the abandonment of the earlier one, of which those forms, in most cases, are manifestly a conventional modification or a corruption. As the whole proceeding is arbitrary throughout and unhistorical, it very often leads to assertions which honest criticism cannot approve.

The attempts to bring back the English Liturgy to the standard of those centuries are in every respect fraught with mischief, and furnish a warning example for all times. That false principle once adopted, the result of such a tendency must be a total misapprehension of the evangelical element, and, ultimately, a relapse to the Roman mass, whether with or without invocation of saints is almost matter of indifference. But what shall we say of the levity, presumption, and delusion, implied in the pompous and empty Liturgy of the so-called Irvingites? Their founder, a pious and eloquent man, honestly mistook the convulsive paroxysms of crude minds and morbid persons, who during his sermons or prayers were seized by the idea of the Infinite, for the Spirit of God; and the naturally incomprehensible words which accompanied them, for His secret message to mankind. What originated in enthusiasm now threatens to end in liturgical pomp and hierarchical pretension. Instead of establishing the idea of the Christian Sacrifice, the followers of Irving have plundered the Liturgies of the Greek and other Churches, with the hands of tyros, without spirit or

learning; and the new apostles act as if their object were indeed to disguise the hollowness and untenableness of their crude enthusiasm under a shallow phraseology and bombastic hierarchical forms, in order to rivet insensibly the same chains upon the world which they promise to loose with the spirit.

As to the so-called Tractarians, we readily admit their merit in endeavouring to infuse spirit into a languishing unspirituality; though we must frankly also admit, that they have sought the ancient spirit in medieval forms, and intellectual liberty in the domain of despotism.

The way of life lies exclusively in imparting new vitality and free development to elements which we find already petrified and disfigured in the stereotyped liturgical formularies, but which are truly Apostolical and evangelical, and traceable to the primitive Church, although not completely carried out in the same. It is precisely because they are only suggestive and symbolical, that the established formularies of the earliest age are still a standing model. They consequently may not only be preserved where they exist, but even freely introduced wherever there is life, on the congregational basis. Thus alone can we hope to restore to new life the genuine Christian act of worship, the different stages of which they significantly point out, and to revive that truly catholic feeling of our connexion with the earliest age of Christianity. Beyond that much may be taken from the spirit, very little from the letter, of the ancient Liturgies. For the benefit of the Eastern congregations who wish to embrace the Gospel, we may endeavour to adopt their national Liturgies to practical use by expunging what does not harmonize with it. But let no one deceive himself on this point; this is at most a state of transition; what remains is more sacerdotal than popular, more formal than spiritual. Those Liturgies are one-sided and defective. They do not satisfy the Christian feelings of our age, and no one feels the weight of antiquated forms more severely than those who have sighed under them and experienced their blighting influence, and who know the abuse which has been made of the letter in order to stifle the spirit.

As regards the Churches of the Reformation, each Church is

called upon, in the first place, to resort to the Spirit of God in herself; consequently, also, to her own treasures, and to everything which the Spirit of God has already striven to utter in her language. There exist, nevertheless, in each of them valuable catholic elements, to be universally received and imitated by the sister Churches. In such elements, notwithstanding all her defects, the English Liturgy is preeminently rich, especially as regards the spirit of dignified propriety and order, the spirit of nationality, and the principle of the active cooperation of the people in the public worship. The copiousness of her liturgical elements is particularly adapted for remedying the nakedness, scantiness, and fragmentary nature of the other Protestant Liturgies, and for establishing the universal idea of divine service as one of worship and adoration. The German Churches, on the other hand, may be a model to the English Church, in so far as they maintain the principle of the free element, both as regards the prayer and the sermon. "Quench not the Spirit," says the Apostle. There is a power in the living outpouring of the Spirit by free prayer, and in a sermon delivered out of the fulness of faith and thought, which a set form and a written sermon do not possess. As regards the psalmody, the mode of singing the Psalms by verses, adopted from the Latin Church by mere accident, that is upon no principle whatever, and the indiscriminate use of them without any selection, are decidedly two great defects. For, as before observed, the Psalms, when sung, cannot be considered as instructive and edifying passages of Scripture, but as the expression of the inmost feelings of the worshipping congregation. The rigid adhesion to the indiscriminate use of the Psalter, instead of using Christian hymns, is connected with the Celto-Romanic literalism and want of faith in the Spirit. It originated in France; and the Reformed Churches of Germany, Holland, and Switzerland originally shared it to a certain extent with the English Church, as already remarked above. In like manner, the Idea of the Choir as a substitute for congregational singing is as unapostolical as it is unspiritual. The choir, where feasible, should form a connecting link between the

clergy and congregation, and raise the activity of the congregation instead of quenching or destroying it. Here, again, the retrograde party have had a correct perception of the defect, but (as was the natural consequence of their perverted instinct) have adopted the opposite method for removing it. Instead of encouraging the singing of Christian hymns, and generally strengthening the organic activity of the congregation by singing, they have, wherever they could, abolished it altogether, fancying, at the same time, that in so doing they were representing Christian antiquity. The living choir of the congregation is the Parish School. Out of it a real choral singing may everywhere be formed, that is, a choir singing in parts without any organ accompaniment: not to be substituted for the singing of the congregation, but to raise and animate it. In towns, wherever a system of instruction in singing and Church music exists, such choirs may execute the most sublime compositions.

But as to the hymns themselves, it is in the domain of sacred hymnology that the development of the Church since the Reformation has produced a work which has a marked place in universal history, and which will survive in future ages, after most of the literary products of the last three centuries shall have been long forgotten. In the Lutheran Church of Germany alone, of all ancient and modern Churches, the spirit of God has organically formed the great lyric epos of Christianity, exhibiting the divine development of God's revelation to man in the universal Christian Church. Such a historical epos can indeed be composed out of the German Church hymns, and only out of them. The German hymns represent the only unbroken series of poetry in the German language; and, besides, together with some twenty or thirty classical hymns of the ancient and medieval Latin Churches, form a grand whole of sacred inspiration, composed instinctively during fifteen centuries. The music to these German hymns, or the so-called choral airs, is again the only example of living renewal and artistic development of that ancient composition commonly called the Ambrosian. The psalmody, on the other hand, or Gregorian chant of the Psalms, born out of the Greek recitative, has been not only retained in the English Church, but, though

in a one-sided and not very systematic and classical manner, richly developed according to the national taste of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In regard to lyrical music for the service, however, Palæstrina remains as unapproached, as do Sebastian Bach and Händel in the dramatic. But this dramatic sacred music, of which the so-called oratorio is the spiritual expression, is not adapted for Church service. For this service excludes musical instruments, which are an inseparable part of the oratorio. The organ forms an exception, because it is simply a substitute for the human voice, and ought properly only to supply the want of singing in parts, and to be treated as strengthening the singing of the whole congregation. For this reason the interludes (*Zwischenspiele*) between the lines of the hymns are a nuisance, which crept into the German Churches in the dreary times of the seventeenth century. The power of the organ, and the art of the organist, may be shown before and after the service.

We must not omit this opportunity of saying a few words upon Church Architecture. It is her province first to speak truth, secondly to do her work in good style. She has consequently to satisfy real wants, while she is to exhibit at the same time the typical character of the Church. In such a typical, universal, intelligible character stands the basilica-form, deeply imprinted into the European Christian life. In reference to these two points, I have, therefore, no hesitation in saying, that the form of the basilicas of the third and fourth centuries might be applied, with slight modification, to the Evangelical service. The idea of the old basilica can be equally well realized in the antique style of architecture, as in the Byzantine and Gothic: only, then, let it be a correct, and not a corrupt, style. The case is very different, however, with regard to the adoption of the medieval cathedral architecture, as being the fundamental form of the Celto-Romanic style. The medieval church may either be carried out in the medieval (Byzantine or Gothic) style of architecture, or in the modern Roman, like St. Peter's and the churches of Palladio. But it is always calculated for a medieval Liturgy and service. The so-called Gothic, formerly termed the Germanic, but which I should prefer to call the

Celto-Romanic, must consequently be created anew for the restored basilicas, that is to say, must be organically adapted to them. It is a beautiful alphabet, with which one may compose basilicas as well as Cathedrals. Above all, however, in every living restoration of ecclesiastical architecture, the untruthfulness must be got rid of, which has worked its way into all modern architecture, and especially into this elevated branch of it, particularly in the case of the churches of the Jesuits. In a true restoration of church architecture, care will be taken not to pay any attention to appearance and show, out of fondness for antiquity, but, at the same time, to meet every real want in an artistic manner, with Christian truth and honesty and Evangelical and Protestant freedom. The aim will be to give one distinct character to the fore part of the church (which may be called the Sermon-church), and another to the Altar-church, the place of worship and of the Communion service. These two must be kept separate, and yet both be treated as parts of an organic whole. The most conspicuous part of the one is the Pulpit and Reading-Desk, that of the other the Communion table. The pulpit must not appear as a piece of furniture, but must grow organically out of the idea of the whole building. This must be the effort of the genius which aims at building a place for the Church of the Future, worthy of the Spirit and of Art; but any truth is better and more beautiful than all show and all untruth.

Still, how is a living Christian architecture possible, unless the idea of worship, of which it ought to be the architectonic form, has already found its expression spiritually in the organization of the congregation, and liturgically in the form of Divine service?

In this respect, however, the defects visible in the English Church are infinitely more glaring in the Churches of the Continent. We want a creative form for the reanimation of that idea in which the whole Christian service originated. It is clear, from what has been said before, that this idea can be no other than the pure exhibition of the view of Christian sacrifice, unfettered by any negation, or any tradition, institution, or external consideration; such a sacrifice as is expressed clearly enough in the Gospels and Epistles, and such as forms the basis

of the whole life of worship in the ancient Church, although not freely developed there.

In this restoration, the National element will have to be embodied on one side; the Universal or Catholic element on the other. But, above all, the process must go on from the internal to the external, not from the external to the internal: and the only inward vital germ of future life is in the organization of congregational life.

IV.

THE PICTURE AND IMPORT OF THE OTHER CEREMONIES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

If we turn our eyes towards the other sacred acts of the ancient Church, the ceremony which appears to us as the most important is that of Reception or Baptism, a picture of which is given in the First Book. Of the other sacred acts we know very little.

In the *Marriages* of the ancient Christians, the congregation appeared more in its constitutional than in its devotional character. The marriage was arranged with the consent of the Church, according to the law of the Land. If the couple were both Christians, they probably received the bishop's or elder's benediction at the Lord's table. Holy, however, and awful (as a mystery, or sacrament) was Marriage itself, not its liturgical solemnization.

As regards the *Burial of the Dead*, the emperor Julian mentions it expressly, as exemplary and commendable from its dignity and solemnity. Fixed liturgical forms for it, however, did not exist. But the allusions of St. Chrysostôm to the psalms used on that occasion, the description left us by Augustin of the funeral ceremonies of his pious mother, and a few hymns of the same century of the Church, show that the inexhaustible Psalm-book, partly perhaps in conformity with Jewish precedents, was made use of at those funerals, in the sense of faith and hope. Even at the present day, in the Eastern as well as Western Church, the unadulterated Gregorian chant, with a dignified slow execution, is the most ancient, as well as, for those who understand what is sung, most affecting, part of the ritual. No rational doubt can be entertained that the congregation made mention of their deceased brethren at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as early as the third century.

We have already explained, in our picture of Divine service, the order in which the Prayers were arranged at this solemnity. The custom of Funeral Feasts, as will be shown in the Fourth Book, was borrowed from the heathen: but these were rendered orderly and pure, and the wealthy used them as opportunities for performing acts of charity, by making large contributions to their poorer brethren.

Among modern ordinances, the English Funeral Service is a model of dignity and solemnity, and beautiful in its choice of the psalms. The German Lutheran Service, however, has its own noble elements of spiritual poetry, in common with the most ancient Church. In the Marriage Ceremony both are exemplary; but here, again, by the side of the truly grand national work of the English Liturgy, the Liturgies of distracted Germany show only classical elements clumsily put together; the natural consequence of provincial dismemberment.

BOOK IV.

THE RULES OF CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE CONGREGATIONAL, SOCIAL, AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS.

UNDER this title we have collected every particular furnished by the genuine texts as to the general life of Christians. It is not our intention to discuss the details here. Such of them as required explanation have already been examined sufficiently for our purpose in the preceding pages. The only point which concerns us here, moreover, is their import for universal history and this we shall best bring under the notice of our readers, by referring the most important definitions to the general point of view of philosophical history.

Congregational life was, in the eyes of the early Christians, not so much the connecting link between domestic and public life, as it was essentially the extended domestic, and the only public life which was valuable or accessible to the Christian. The members of the Church were brothers and sisters to each other. The Church itself was a free commonwealth, and, in very early times, felt that it was the organic member of a vast commonwealth destined to embrace the world. Every thing which lay beyond this luminous point was dark, hostile, and doomed to destruction, as being "this world," that is, the political order of the Roman empire, which was destined to perish, as well as the national existence of the Jews.

The Christian life was based upon Christian customs. If the domestic customs were respectable, the congregational were holy; for they constituted the separation between light and darkness, faith and unbelief, holiness and ungodliness. To these customs belonged, first of all, the practice of Fasting,

which was connected with Divine service; and the observation of Sunday as the Lord's day, with or without that of the Saturday as Sabbath: the frequent, and in some Churches daily partaking of the Communion: and the rule for the admission of foreign elders to offer the benediction before the Holy Supper.

The fasting which was commanded by Christ was a private abstinence from food, for the purpose of producing tranquillity of mind. Thus in our genuine collections there does not exist a single ordinance which enters into this private life of the individual. It was only in Passion week, when the congregation regularly assembled every day, and with pious thoughts turned into their own bosoms, bewailing the sins which had betrayed the Lord and crucified Him, that a common fast was observed as a congregational ordinance. The death of Christ occupied their minds, especially on the day of our Lord's betrayal, the Wednesday, and the day of His crucifixion, Friday. Now, as the children of the family refrain from the social joyous family meal when their father is taken away from them, so did the Church on those days in that week, but still with a rational liberty according to circumstances. This alone suffices to show that the fasting of the Holy week was not an unqualified abstinence from food, but a common ordinance for limiting them to bread and unsavoury dishes (xerophagy). In this sense, it is true that in the age before us, in occasional instances, a forty days' fast was kept as a pious custom, in reference to the forty days' fasting of Jesus in the Wilderness, and commonly the weekly fasts on Wednesday and Friday. But the Alexandrian Collections show that the origin of this custom of fasting and of the ordinance had reference to Passion week, and that care was taken to trace it back to the institutions of the Apostles.

The celebration of the day of our Lord's Resurrection was already more solemnly observed than the Jewish Sabbath, considered as the eve of the great solemnity. We nowhere, however, find a trace of that relapse into Jewish ceremonial, the unchristian interruption of congregational Church and social life, which some persons in the English and Scotch Churches, amiable in other respects, maintain to be a divine institution binding upon all Christians; and who are not contented with

defending a wise and free popular custom, which may be, within certain limits, a necessary *correctio* for many people, as Christian and moral in the idea. It is consolatory to see that a man so strongly attached to positive Church doctrines, and so earnest as Hengstenberg, has voluntarily come forward to oppose the abuse of this custom, in a little work of his which has lately appeared, containing thoroughly sound principles upon the observation of Sunday. Judaism remains Judaism, and is both foreign and in opposition to the Gospel.

The Love-feasts (Church- and House-book, p. 60. sqq.) were the connecting link between the congregational life of the Church and her social life. It was the hallowing of the Syssitiæ, or common meals of the ancient world, which, as a remnant of the old Germanic custom, holds, even to the present day, so important a place in England and the United States. In primitive times, the object was nothing less than an assemblage of persons, especially at the common meals, for the purpose of purifying themselves from all idolatrous customs, as well as from all immorality and irregularities, which had eaten, like a canker, into the whole framework of society in the latter ages of the decline and fall of Greece and Rome. Thus, long after they had ceased to be connected with the Church celebration of the Lord's Supper, these Love-feasts of the early Christians were instituted and perpetuated; brotherly meals which still partially take place in the Churches, and from which the bishop should never have absented himself, because the feeling of the original association in a social religious meal has still survived. Now it was by these that the purification of common life was prepared against the time when God should renew the world, that is to say, should will to send a new fresh natural element, a people endued with strong vital powers, for the complete constitutional development of the germ implanted in families and Churches which were rescued from destruction.

Such is the historical import of the custom here alluded to, relative to the Love-feasts or Agapæ of the primitive Christians.

Now their entire common life, the congregational Church and social life, rested on the Christian reform of domestic life, with

which we have also connected all the other rules and maxims which affect individual Christians. Many of these exhibit the character of the ancient world, which was possessed by a dread of demons, and, under an anxious apprehension of the influence of charms, sought for external preservatives against the powers of Evil, and accompanied their prayers with external signs and gestures. The point to be especially noticed here is, that our ordinance (p. 66. supra) expressly says that the important thing is for the believers to know that the sign is only a sign, and the heart and faith the main point, the real preservative.

The Remembrance of the Dead forms a part of the duties of domestic as well as common life. Both Jewish and heathen custom tended to support the general feeling of humanity. The Service for the Dead, the pious care for the departed, represented by prayers, sacrifices, and remembrances, was more deeply rooted in the religion of the old Greeks and Romans than any other of its ordinances, and in the ancient Christian service survived the fall of heathenism. Precisely in the same manner, among the Chinese, there is scarcely any other living remain of old faith and old nationality existing, except this custom of pious superstition.

I have sufficiently pointed out, in the preceding Book, what was the Apostolical ground, and what was the obscure point of this custom in the primitive Church.

At the very end of the Church- and House-Book (p. 70. supra) is given one of the two injunctions of the Church of Jerusalem, by which the Apostles connected that Christian community with the Gentile Christians in Antioch: namely, the command to abstain from eating the Sacrificial Meats. This command, and that against Fornication, were the two starting-points and fundamental pillars of Christian Church discipline, or congregational order. The first abolished the worship of idols, which was inseparably connected with all the art and civilization of antiquity, as well as with the whole political life of heathenism. It contained a testimony against idolatry which the existing tyrants of the world could not effectually gainsay. It was the first declaration of war by the spirit of freedom and human dignity, which was driven back into the inward recesses of the con-

science. It accordingly also, for that very reason, led to a collision with the powers of this world, and made Christians detested by the Greeks and Romans, still more than Jews, because they were, for the most part, brethren and children of their own nationality, not sons of the exclusive Jewish nation, who kept themselves aloof in hostile isolation. But it was in reference to this war, that our Lord uttered those sublime words so historically important (Luke, xii. 49.), shortly after he entered upon his office of teacher: "Fire I am come to throw on the earth; and how do I desire it was already kindled!" The first command cast the Divine firebrand into that old world which was doomed to destruction. The second penetrated still deeper into the heart of heathenism, and even of the then existing Judaism; and it requires the child-like innocence of Neander, to comprehend how that historian should have expressed his wonder that it could have been necessary to issue such a command, on such a subject, for the first time, to men embracing Christianity.

With this second command is connected a point noticed in a remarkable passage of the Greek text of the Constitutions (p. 72. supra), in regard to domestic life, the relative position of master and servant, and the matrimonial relations.

We would, first of all, remark, commencing with the first, that the relation between master and slave not only expresses that of a master of a house and his servant, but also that of an employer and his workman: for in those times all manufacturing operations were performed by slaves. We have, on that account, already made some remarks, among our observations upon the Catechumens, as to the social importance of the claims that Christianity, which was to reform the world from within and from below, made upon its followers. Our Apostolical ordinance prescribes that the Christian master shall not make his slaves work more than five days in the week. The Saturday and Sunday were to be appropriated to their instruction in religious duties. This essentially includes the whole question of the present day, as to giving workmen in manufactories school education and an opportunity of attending the Church service. In Passion and Easter weeks, more-

over, it was enjoined that no work should be done, in order that they might have more especial instruction in Christianity.

What an attack upon the kingdom of insatiable Mammon! What arrogance on the part of a few miserable outcasts, vagabond Jews and their adherents among the lower classes of Roman society! We can thus easily comprehend the hatred of the whole world, of which Tacitus speaks; and the injunction mentioned in the Apocalypse as given by the persecuting Jews and heathens, not to buy anything of Christians, and to exclude them as much as possible, as enemies of the gods and of men, from all intercourse of social life. But still, at all events, it was a *heathen* state and a *heathen* society, which was leagued with Rabbinism to proscribe and persecute the principle of Christianity. If, now, that proud mistress of the world and her people perished for their resistance to the religion of the Spirit and of freedom, how can existing governments and nations which confess Christ with their lips but serve Mammon, and are in bondage to the most selfish gratifications, just as if there were no other world but this and its treasures, how can they, I say, escape from the like destruction? And oh the blind prophets and theologians! who interpret the signs of the Apocalypse, and explain as prophetic of our days what had reference to the fall of Jerusalem and of Rome, and yet are struck with such blindness as to the signs of their own times! Oh the fools! who, if they do see the imminent perils of this age, think to ward them off by narrow-minded persecution of such as differ from them in opinion, and by maintaining external forms and hypocritical customs! But they are as utterly incompetent really to divine the signs of that momentous past, as they are to interpret those of the present time. They are waiting (like the Jews) for the consummation of that which has been long ago accomplished, and misunderstand not only the Apocalypse, but the words of the Gospel also. They cannot comprehend the universal judgment of history which lies before their eyes; all which preaches the same truth, only in still stronger and clearer language than the veiled visions in that book. The forecast of the Apostles, and the prophecies of the Apocalypse, are fulfilled; and the words of Christ are

verified to the letter. The generation of the Apostles did not pass away until Jerusalem had fallen, and the axe was laid at the roots of Rome, and, in fact, by Christianity itself. This was not done by superhuman force, nor, again, by natural force, but by spiritual fire; that consuming Divine fire which is inherent in the doctrine of Christ.

The mighty lever which put in operation the religious and moral influences which have renewed the world lay in the most holy relation of mankind, in marriage. Christianity found concubinage recognized by law, the legitimate established form under which the two sexes lived together. Divorces, however, were frequent, even among the Jews themselves. The legislation of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, for restoring the dignity of the ancient Roman marriage, proved, like all external reforms in the spiritual domain, utterly ineffectual. The main points in the law of a marriage enacted by the Apostles were nothing but the honest conclusions drawn by believers from the words of Christ. We might condense them into the following canons:

"The husband owes to the wife the same constancy which she owes to him: 'Let the marriage-bed be undefiled,' says the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

"Married couples form a unity of person, like the unity of the Lord with His Church: the husband, consequently, cannot give his wife a bill of divorcement, except for the cause of adultery, that is, on account of infidelity. For adultery, as a betrayal of the privilege of maternity which has been confided to her, is, as it were, her civil death, and dissolves the partnership for life, as does natural death.

"The wife, however, cannot separate herself from her husband on account of his infidelity, so as to be free from the bond of wedlock.

"To marry a woman divorced for anything but her own infidelity, in the lifetime of her husband, is adultery: for the repudiated wife ought to wait for reconciliation; she is bound so long as her husband lives."

As regards the forbidden degrees of consanguinity and affinity, the Christians evidently observed in primitive times the injunctions of the Law. The 19th Apostolic canon forbids an

ecclesiastic to marry his sister-in-law, his uncle's daughter, or his niece (as being the first degree of consanguinity), just as it forbids him to contract a second marriage, or to espouse a divorced woman, a concubine, or an unchaste person. This, consequently, was an enactment against something of ordinary occurrence in common Christian life, although the person so marrying was blamed.

The Christian woman herself, however, was looked upon in a very different light to the Jewess and the heathen. She was honoured as a co-heiress of the kingdom of heaven, as sharing the same responsibilities and the same hopes. And the woman made ample return to Christianity for what Christianity did for her. In the higher as well as the lower classes, it was woman who made most of the converts to the religion of mankind, and, during persecutions, displayed the courage of the hero with the discipline of the virgin.

We have reached here the inmost centre of the spiritual power of Christianity, the feeling of moral responsibility, of the spiritual independence of all its members, poor and rich, educated and uneducated, men and women, young men and maidens. This feeling of moral responsibility rests, however, essentially upon faith in the divine power and the godlike strength of man, in the moral liberty to combat the selfish desires of his senses and passions, and to act according to the voice of conscience, as the voice of God in him.

And we now call upon every observer of history and of the present times, conscientiously to inquire whether this fundamental power of Christianity is more general in the great mass of the population, in countries where the Reformation has been adopted, or in those which have remained under the dominion of Rome: and again, whether it is stronger in those Catholic countries which have not been affected at all by the Reformation, or in those which have experienced its influence, even though it be only on account of their immediate vicinity to Protestantism. The answer of one and all is written with letters of fire (and with a back-ground of blood) on the leaves of the history of the world.

The second question, however, we address to those who, in

England or Germany, say, or who follow those who say, that the misery of our times, and the decline of Christianity, can be remedied by calling upon individuals and nations simply to do what the Clergy has ordered, or is ordering, or will order, for them, under promise of salvation if they obey, and under pain of damnation if they do not; in short, by the restoration of that sacerdotal power over the consciences and religious convictions of men which their fathers rejected in faith, as unchristian, by a solemn declaration and protest.

It would be presumptuous to suppose that any person whose blindness on these points cannot be removed by the Gospel, and by the history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and of the bloody struggle against it on the part of the Catholic dynasties and the priesthood, will have his eyes opened by the picture of the ancient Church. But, at all events, this picture condemns them when they appeal to that primitive Church; a great and glorious time, although not free from the defects of a sinking age. Almost all the lies and frauds in history, law, constitution, and doctrine have gradually been given up step by step, from the Decretals down to the Pseudo-Dionysius, not from goodwill, but from the mere impossibility of maintaining the discussion. The few remaining isolated props of the system, upon which honest investigators might formerly differ in opinion, give way more and more every day.

The age is at this moment in the birth-throe; whether for destruction or conservation is uncertain, but assuredly not for the permanent establishment of a power of falsehood and oppression, and assuredly as little for the foundation of a pretorian imperialism in the heart of civilized Europe, as of a lying Jesuitism, its ally.

On the other hand, however, it must not be disguised, that the one-sidedness of the ancient Church, and the infinitely greater of the middle ages, cannot be abolished or avoided, unless the whole European life be reformed upon Christian and Evangelical principles; common social life as well as worship, political life as well as ecclesiastical. The ancient Church sunk into ritualism, because social and political life was extinct. The middle ages could not recover the equilibrium, because

that ritualism had made a clerical congregation the mistress of the world. The highest realization of the idea of religion, of the sacrifice of self, consists in carrying out in the life the vow made in the act of worship. There is no distinction of works, no good works for the Church: the divinely high or good work is life in faith, the fulfilment of the high or humble vocation which every one may have assigned him, whether it be the prince's or the philosopher's, the clergyman's or the shoemaker's, according to the legend of St. Antony, so highly prized by Luther. But as the realization of the Christian principle is more completely carried out in married than in single life, in the congregation more than in the domestic circle; so is its realization in the people, as a nation, by means of a State constituted on Christian principles, and consequently free by sovereign law, the highest aim of Christianity. The noblest minds and people are now striving to bring about this sovereignty of the law, which is the divine right of every human sovereignty. The victory is certain, if people and governments will meet one another as in the presence of Christ, to whom they both appeal. Christ is to become People, as eighteen centuries ago He became Man; for it is only through Peoples and States enjoying Christian freedom that He can become Mankind. But nations must, out of love to God, individually sacrifice self for the community, if governments are to make the greatest of all sacrifices, that of dictatorial power.

The Law-Book of the Ante-Nicene Church.

When the position of the clergy developed itself as a special one, but still within the congregation, certain legislative institutions became necessary, for maintaining discipline and order in this corporation. Such was the origin of the "Definitions," or declarations of spiritual law, of which Hippolytus speaks. The most ancient collection of these "Definitions" contains about thirty, which were embodied in the second century by some one well acquainted with the subject, into a summary of what was considered, in the consciousness of the Church, as sanctioned by custom immemorial. This first Collection consisted of three chapters.*

	Total.
I. On Ordination: Canons I. II. - - - -	2
II. On the Oblation and Communion: III—V. VIII. XII. - - - - - - - - - -	8
III. On Acts which deprive of official Rights or Offices: XIII—XXIV. XXV. XXVI. XXVIII. XXXIV.	20
Sum total,	30 canons.

To these were appended, but at an early date:

IV. On the rights and duties of the Bishop: XXX —XLI. - - - - - - - - - -	7
and subsequently, when the collection thus extended had been formed:	
V. Other Grounds of Deprivation: XLII—LXV. -	5
Complete genuine Collection,	42 canons.

* See Table of Contents of the Law-Book, p. 76. sqq., to be compared with the Essays on the Constitutions and on the Canons. Upon the canon (XXXV.) about the metropolitan system, see above, p. 133. As to the ancient canons concerning the marriage of the clergy (XVII—XIX.), compared with the later interpolations (VI. XXVII. XLVII.), see p. 137., and what has been said about Hippolytus himself on this subject.

Thus far the criticism of this collection brings us by internal evidence. But the Collection of the Church of Alexandria, which has come down to us, authentically proves that the canons from XLVII. to L. were added afterwards. As an interpolation was made into the earliest collections of the Thirty Definitions, so was an ordinance upon the marriage of the clergy (XLVIII.) inserted into the extended collection, and doubtless in the third or the first years of the fourth century.

Thus, therefore, the collection, when critically examined upon the history of the marriage of the clergy, authenticates the gradual establishment of a varying particular law for them by the very fact of the later custom being inserted into the collection which was already held as authority by the Church.

The Second Collection, which is not recognized by the Roman Church, bears already a more decided character of a Law-Book for the internal discipline of the clergy, with penal enactments. It contains three "Definitions" which are evidently post-Nicene: canon LXXXI. manifestly a repetition and confirmation of a former one (in the First Collection, can. XX. comp. with XXXI.); and canons LXXXIII. and LXXXIV. which are inseparable, and neither of which harmonizes with what precedes. It is obvious that the appended canon of Scripture is spurious from the very fact of its contradicting, in many points, the authentic traditions and assumptions of the early Church. Moreover, it is wanting in the oldest MS. of the present text, the celebrated Codex Barberinus.*

We have to establish three especial points for our survey of universal history.

First: that this primitive Ecclesiastical Law is the earliest law of a really free corporation, formed at the period of the decay of all the others.

Secondly: that this law was essentially a congregational law, and implies the legislative cooperation of the Christian people, as well as do the first legal definitions of the Church of Jerusalem.

Thirdly: that the judicial proceeding connected with it (upon

* See Appendix on the text of the Apostolical Canons.

which some regulations occur in the second section of the Text-Book) contains many of the germs of the Christian criminal trial, as they have been subsequently worked out by English legislation. The rack came to the canonical process from the civil legislation: but the only Christian method of discovering truth, even without such a spiritual rack as the compulsory confession of the inquisitorial process, namely, the examination and cross-examination of witnesses, originated in the Canon Law.

As regards the new Canon Law it begins with the Decretals, which were forged by the Latin priests and sanctioned by the popes, and closes with the canons of James I. of the year 1604, which are foreign to the Common Law of England to this day, from their never having received the sanction of Parliament. They appear, moreover, as far as the known records go, to be only the resolutions of the province of Canterbury. The connecting links of this Canon Law with the Ecclesiastical Law of the age of Hippolytus are: first, misunderstandings and abuses; secondly, fraud and forgeries; thirdly, the sanction by that same absolute power which raised its throne upon those misunderstandings, abuses, and forgeries. There exists, most certainly, a historical connexion between the two, but it is highly illegitimate and shameful. The Canon Law of the Roman Church has, historically, been based upon the principles and usages recorded by our so-called Apostolical Canons; but in spirit and substance it is in contradiction to the constitution, principles, and practice of the ancient Church, from one end to the other. Its practical cement with the genuine ancient Ecclesiastical Law is blood. Its very life is based upon the death of the legitimate power of the congregation, and the denial of the supreme sovereignty of the whole visible Church, which is, as Hooker says in his seventh book, "the true original subject of all power." What distinguished the power of one bishop from that of another, in the ecclesiastical sense, was the circumstance of his being assisted by a council of elders, whereas his colleague in the next village was not. As to the Anglo-Saxon Canons, they are much stronger evidence of the rights of the laity, than those of the Romanizing and imperialized Franks. The canons

of 750 and 970 are very strong upon that point, as has been shown by the present bishop of Oxford in his highly instructive work on the Episcopal Church of the United States; and lately by the Rev. William Goode, in his Defence of the expressions used by the present venerable Primate of the Church of England respecting the validity of non-episcopal ordinations, against certain attacks and anathemas which betray as little learning as charity. The author of that Defence shows that not only the two living historians of the English Constitution, Hallam and Macaulay, but also the great Bacon, and the most eminent defenders of episcopacy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, protest against such a doctrine, which, indeed, was not held by Laud himself.

The point at issue with the Anomians is, that Church government exists by divine right; with the Judaizers, that the supreme legislative authority of the Church is in the Christian people. Divine unselfish love, which has founded both World and Church, can alone regenerate and reform them.

RETROSPECTIVE VIEW.

THE REGENERATION OF THE WORLD IN PROTESTANT STATES. — THE LAW OF DIVORCE AND THE LAW OF SLAVERY.

Let us cast one retrospective glance over our picture! The hidden germs of life have been developed into a new world, which in our day is growing into colossal proportions, with a full consciousness on the part of mankind that their choice lies between the awful alternatives of death and regeneration.

The great work of Christianity is before us. It is not a hierarchy with her rich rituals and her ritualistic art and conventional science; its miracle is the real world in which we live. It is the individual, standing before his God with his Bible and his self-responsible conscience, whether man or woman, layman or clerk. It is the Christian household founded on mutual trust. It is the congregation with its own shepherd and his pattern household. It is the Christian municipality, controuling itself by the self-government and mutual confidence which exist in its members. It is the Christian nation and state, with her national schools based upon the Gospel of the persecuted Church; with her universities expanding in the Christian philosophy founded by the martyrs; with her national hospitals grown out of the nurseries of the deaconesses of old; and with her Poor-Law, consecrating Christian support as a national debt; finally, with her sovereignty of law, and with her religious and civil liberty, advancing by reform and not by revolution.

Where that work and that faith in its divine power live, there is Apostolicity, and there is the future of the world, for there is Christ.

All Christian tribes and nations, if we compare them with the rest of mankind, are, in a larger sense, the monument of this regenerating process. This work of regeneration is visible in the history of the nations of the Eastern Church, in spite

of her early stereotyped ritualism and of the Imperial absolutism and Muhammedan despotism of her rulers. It is in some respects still more perceptible in the history of the nations of the Latin Church, in spite of the systematic tyranny of Rome, and in spite of a conventional mediæval dogmatism. But the Reformation marks so strongly the commencement of a new regenerative process, that in some respects it surpasses the effects of the first outpouring of the Spirit of God over mankind, in the very beginning of Apostolic Christianity. Whatever oscillations have taken place, and are taking place, in isolated individuals, no Protestant nation has ever voluntarily returned to Catholicism; no one parish, or part of one, has abandoned the standard of the Gospel, in order to return to priestly rule: whereas, in spite of persecution, and all the machinery of the combined absolute power of prince and priest, wherever a religious spirit pervades the age and penetrates the masses, we see whole communities come over to the Gospel, and, regardless of persecutions, show themselves ready to sacrifice all for a faith connected with their individual conscience. The Protestant missions have created, out of the corrupted savages of Tahiti, a Christian self-governing people, in whom neither bayonets, nor brandy, nor any similar means of conversion, have been able to destroy the germ of independent spiritual life. Compare this with the great monument of Jesuit missions, the much-extolled Paraguay, where docile machines were formed, unable to march without leading-strings, and ready to become the easy prey of the first adventurer who undertook to tyrannize over them instead. And what has been the result, as to the Chinese nation, of all the efforts and intrigues of the Jesuits at the Tatar court of Pekin? which of the elements set at work there has kindled new life among the most ancient civilized nation of the world? The present Protestant movement may miscarry, but a moral reform founded upon faith never perishes. Will the Protestant villages perish which have in Tinevelly formed themselves into well organized parishes, sometimes with the Brahmin among them? And what have we observed at the sources of the Jordan in Hasbeya? what do we now see, to our astonishment, occurring throughout Syria and Mesopotamia?

But why do I speak of distant missions and countries! Have not more than seventy congregations been formed in France, since the Restoration, out of Roman Catholic parishes? Who does not know that whole nations would fly to the Gospel, if the bayonets did not prevent them? These observations will suffice to show where the principle of life is at work in our age, and what are the real signs of the times. But what is this progressive and regenerative process now going on throughout modern Europe, on both sides of the great ocean, but the work of the Reformation? Its rejection has crushed, and lamed, and is convulsing continually the most richly gifted, once the freest and most powerful nation of the world; whereas those who have received the faith of the Gospel have grown from nameless provinces and tribes into nations, from small and second-rate powers into world-ruling states, merely by the regenerative moral element which is in them. It may be said on the whole, as the result of the events of the first three centuries of the Reformation, that in dynasties, as well as in nations, the regenerating and conservative element has been the Protestant principle, and that the renovating and reconstructive Spirit of God is now, as a national principle of action, only visibly at work in Protestant nations and states, and almost invariably in proportion as the reforming principle of the sixteenth century has been carried out faithfully and in the spirit of the Gospel, through all branches of social and political life.

If the history of the world from 1517 to 1815 has taught this great truth to all those who faithfully inquire and try to understand the spirit of the times, the forty years of peace which have since elapsed must have opened the eyes even of the blind. What noble efforts were made by wise and virtuous and patriotic men, to establish religious and civil liberty! And why have they failed? Because civil and religious liberty is not the fruit of godless civilization but of moral reformation. They have failed in Roman Catholic countries, because the bigotry of an anti-national or at least extra-national clergy, the ignorance of the lower classes who only understand by religion a system of observances, and finally a decided unbelief, if not in Christianity, at least in moral self-responsibility, among the inhabi-

tants of the towns and the higher classes, are not elements of liberty but of despotism. These are the reasons why even the sincerest attempts to introduce real reforms into society and government have been frustrated. The deluge of 1848 was almost universal; its waves beat even up to the shores of Great Britain: but, if we look to the great masses, which are the states and nations that have emerged and are emerging from it? which are those still submerged and more grievously oppressed than before? Is it those conducted on the Protestant principle, or those led by the clerical power? What is become of the Hymn of Pio Nono? what of his reforms? Reform is the watchword when the hour of danger is at hand; but where is reform possible except where liberty exists? where is liberty possible except where there is self-government? where is there self-government without mutual confidence? where mutual confidence, except where there is self-control in the individual? and how can self-control become the national principle, the principle of action among the people, where religion is not identified with morality, and religious belief with the free moral conviction of its truth and of its identity with conscience and reason? The success of Belgium and the hopes of Sardinia rest upon the Protestant principle of not leaning upon the hierarchy as the means of government.

There are, however, two dark spots in this social picture: the Law of Divorce in some of the Protestant States of Europe, and the Law of Slavery in the United States. I shall offer upon both some brief remarks, which a retrospective glance over the picture of Church life will amply confirm.

The Law of Divorce is part of the Law of Marriage, and ought, in Christian states, to be in unison with Christian principles. We have seen what these principles were in early Christianity: the Gospel and the Epistles show what they ought to be. The Latin Church, seduced by St. Augustine's sentimentality and utter want of common sense in points of law, has cut the knot by prohibiting divorce altogether, although such a prohibition is in glaring contradiction with the clear precept of Christ, with

the doctrine of the Apostles, and with the discipline and practice of the ancient Church. The consequence of this unbelieving discipline has been, that in exclusively Roman Catholic states marriage has become to be considered as divorce. If you will make the marriage tie independent of its moral basis, the sanctity of the marriage life, you destroy what you intend to strengthen. Now the principles and germs of Protestant legislation in the sixteenth century were right, and identical over the whole of Europe. They may be reduced to the following formula. Marriage is indissoluble except by death: death is natural or civil; civil death is incurred by adultery, and by pertinacious, wilful desertion, when well established. This principle is proclaimed by the Reformation in England, and by all ecclesiastical ordinances of reformed governments on the Continent. But this germ was nowhere fully and consistently developed. In England the hierarchical reaction under James the First (which commenced under Elizabeth, and was not broken up by the monarchical reform of 1688 and the following years) produced one of the most glaring contradictions in principle and practice which the history of legislation exhibits. The Protestant principle, as to adultery (on the part of the wife), was maintained in acts of the highest legislative authority, but denied in the courts of justice. These courts judged according to the mediæval canon law, which admits of no divorce. Thus, by strict law, separation alone could be pronounced: the dissolution of the matrimonial tie required an Act of Parliament (a *privilegium* in the classical sense of the term); and divorce thus became, as it has well been said, the privilege of the aristocracy. The principle of civil death, as the consequence of pertinacious, wilful desertion, was entirely lost sight of in courts of law, and not even theoretically developed in works on jurisprudence. Thus, the middle and lower classes had no redress in either case, and the lowest retained the old Briton* (not Saxon) custom of legalizing the dissolution of marriage, in case of the infidelity of the woman, by a fictitious sale, which has given rise to so many absurd fables. The only counterpoise to the pernicious consequences which ensued was the sound moral state of the middle classes, raised by the Puritan

* See Auxiliaire Breton, Nov. 1840.

movement of the middle of the seventeenth century, and confirmed by the moral settlement of the constitutional monarchy in 1688.

The Scotch, Dutch, and Swiss reformers, with Puritanical zeal, overstepped on the other side, more or less, the boundaries of civil legislation, by making adultery a public crime, punishable with death, whereas the ancient Church wisely reserved the right of complaint exclusively to the injured party. The Lutheran Churches finally (with the exception of free Sweden) fell under the yoke of consistorial courts named by the Prince, and therefore were thrown upon civil legislation, which was always dictatorial, sometimes of doubtful morality. These courts found themselves insensibly involved in the legal quibbles of half-sentimental half-servile latitudinarians, doctors and professors, the advisers of the Princes. These theorists established the sentimental principle, that adultery might be interpreted in the intellectual sense. But before such theories became law, the moral obtuseness of the nobility, and the corruption of the courts in Germany, during the eighteenth century, had produced a scandalous laxity in the legal practice. Such was, besides, the imperfection of the legal proceedings substituted for the radically abolished canon law, that marriages were dissolved under the letter of the ancient law, for mere wicked sensual gratification, by collusion between the two parties. Adultery was feigned or committed, in order to be detected and evidenced, and the dissolution was pronounced in consequence. This state of things was so strongly deprecated about the middle of the eighteenth century, and particularly in Saxony (corrupted by its Roman Catholic court), that the law of divorce enacted by Frederic the Great satisfied the moral feelings of the people, by putting an end to a demoralizing system of fraud, deeply as it wounded the Christian principle by making the marriage tie, theoretically, almost as easy to be dissolved as the ancient legal concubinage. There are, however, three facts which must never be lost sight of. First, that what the civil law now permitted was never sanctioned by any ecclesiastical decision, whether synodically, or by solemn consistorial verdict, even in that lacerated state of mutilated Germany. Secondly, that it was never approved and practically

adopted by the great mass of the population. Thirdly, that the nobility, after its regeneration by the national reforms which ensued after 1806, learned, upon the whole, to show a respect for Christian principles and moral restraint, which the reformers and the national mind, as represented by the middle classes, required in vain from their ancestors in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Every one is now convinced that a reform is necessary, and will soon take place, because the public mind recoils from the laxity of the principles of the last century, and because the system of the seventeenth century is losing ground daily. Ignorance of the ancient Church law, and reactionary aversion to the principle of marriage by civil contract (as it existed in the early Church), merely because that principle was re-established by the Code Napoleon—these, and not popular licentiousness, stand in the way of efficient reform. Many governments seem to have still to learn that Protestant Princes cannot aid Christianity, as their ancestors were called to do three hundred years ago, by dictatorial acts, much less by the aid of the police. The nuptial benediction (like confirmation) is still considered by jurists of European reputation and court theologians to be more sanctified and more sure of respect, when imposed by a police law, than when freely required by the parties. Every one, not as ignorant of ancient Church law as are some prejudiced and narrow-minded men, is aware that matrimony originates in the well-considered mutual consent of the two parties when qualified to form an opinion, that is to say, being of age; and that its consummation, the natural consequence of that consent, constitutes the mystery, the "sacramentum," in marriage, even according to the more approved theory of the Roman Catholic canonists. The civil contract, as well as the religious ceremony, ratifies the pledge: the one ensures its legal consequences, the other hallows it in the face of the congregation, by prayer and moral admonition. The State has nothing to do with the second, when once the principle of intolerance and State-religion is abandoned. It cannot therefore admit of a religious ceremony, substituted for the civil law of the land, having a civil effect. Christianity itself can expect little or no blessing from an act enforced by the law in

order to ensure civil consequences: in France experience shows that the respect attaching to the religious ceremony is in an inverse ratio to the police compulsion. The same results have, as before observed, ensued in England since Peel's legislation.

More than ten years ago, a reform, indeed, was attempted, inspired by most respectable motives. It failed, however, because the project, by which these praiseworthy intentions were intended to be realized, presented itself without any grand, positive, reconstructive, principle; and because, while appealing to religious principles, with the exception of some well-meant but very unprofitable legal admonitions by the ministers of religion, its whole machinery consisted of police-regulations, fines, imprisonment, and an inquisitorial proceeding all together. Public opinion declared itself so strongly against such an anachronism, that the project was abandoned, except as regarded the amendment of the order of procedure. The historian will not see in this opposition a national predilection for either immoral or irreligious laxity in legislation. It was based on the firm and highly honourable grounds of a conviction, that the sanctity of matrimony cannot be enhanced by police regulations, fines, and personal penalties, which, moreover, can never be practically enforced in the higher classes. The whole scheme was besides condemned, being connected with reactionary designs both in political and ecclesiastical affairs. The revolution of 1848 has only retarded a better reform, which is required and will take place in the course of the next ten years.

Here again, according to all appearances, England will take the lead, next year perhaps, and on principles which every friend of Protestant Christianity and of humanity must hail with thankfulness. These indeed can be no other than those of the Gospel. The sequel will be, that the Apostolical practice will be re-established as Christian law, as more or less correctly formulized by our reformers. There is only one point on which any doubt can exist. According to St. Paul's advice (for he lays down no rule, except where he gives it as "a word of the Lord"), as interpreted and applied by the ancient Church, the wife ought under no circumstances to sue for the dissolution of the matrimonial tie, consequently not even on account of the infidelity of the husband.

The universal feeling in the Christian world is unmistakeably in favour of man and woman enjoying a perfectly equal position, in a moral point of view, and every apparent deviation from this principle will be very unpopular with the most respectable portion of society. But the question for the legislator to consider is, whether this feeling would be well applied to the law of divorce, or whether St. Paul's advice, and the undoubted use of the ancient Church (attested even by the Greek canons), be not founded upon an eternally true appreciation of human nature? So long as woman alone can bring forth children, so long can the highest trust of society, namely, the securing the paternity, be imposed only upon woman. Man cannot commit adultery in the strict sense (corrupted by St. Augustine in the western Church), because he cannot falsify his paternity. He may cause another's wife to commit adultery; in which case the complaint lies with the injured husband. The question is, whether his own wife is to have a right of claiming more than what she certainly ought to have, the right of separation; a form which continental legislation has foolishly rejected as papistic. No lawyer who knows the history of canon law will maintain that the form of temporary separation is of papistic origin, and every practical observer of the effects of such separation will acknowledge its expediency. It would far exceed the limits of this sketch to enter into a full discussion of this point, and to go through the whole question as it ought to be treated: and I have no difficulty in saying, that it has never been so treated either by Protestants or Roman Catholics. It is however sufficiently apparent, I think, even from our present point of view, that it must be a question of the highest importance, to define the legal process which ought to be established in matrimonial cases. The old canonical trial is, after all, better than any thing hitherto substituted for it, and exhibits the best specimen of the right use of evidence, and of cross-examination, so well developed in the English trial by jury. The Scotch mode of trying them is inferior to the English, and very imperfect: indeed, if public opinion in Scotland were not so very strict, collusion would be easy under such a system of judicial proceedings.

I have now to consider and pass judgment with the same frankness upon the second dark point in the social system of Protestant humanity: Slavery, as it exists in the southern states of the Union. The opprobrium which this subject has brought upon Protestant Christendom is greater even than that produced by the laxity of the Prussian law of divorce. A book, the marvellous success of which has pronounced the verdict of the human race, and which has received documentary proof by the Key to it, has made this point more prominent in the consciousness of the Christian mind than it ever was before. Now, divesting that topic of all that is based upon erroneous views of the system, or connected with the passions of party-feeling, the conscientious historian, placed upon the elevated point of observation presented to us by the subject of this volume, must say: The legal existence of slavery in itself is not incompatible with Christianity. It is besides an evil engrafted, against their remonstrances, upon those states, when they were English colonies. But the historian must add, that the principle which makes its extinction legally or practically impossible is decidedly anti-Christian: or, in other words, it is incompatible with Christianity, that state legislation should arrogate to itself the inherent right of the slave-holding citizen to manumit his slave, and to prepare him for liberty by allowing him useful education and free labour. There does not exist in the history of any civilized nation, even among the Gentiles, such an encroachment upon the liberty of the citizen, and such an aggressive act of human legislation against the word of Christ and the will of God, as revealed to us in the Gospel and in conscience. The Roman law was harsh throughout, frequently cruel; and this natural hard-heartedness shows itself in the laws respecting their slaves. But the owner of the slave could as well manumit him as he manumitted his son, and could allow him to acquire money for his emancipation as well as education: the end of which was almost invariably manumission. Nor does it require any proof, according to the very texts of the laws and the letter of the decisions of the highest judicial authorities in those states, cited by the illustrious authoress of Uncle Tom's Cabin in her Key (Part II. ch. xiii.), to establish the

fact that in the four States of South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi (and in fact, also, in North Carolina), emancipation cannot be effected, except by a special act of the legislature, sanctioning a solemn and well-grounded act of the owner — an act coupled with the most studied difficulties, and open to most cruel opposition from interested parties.

The law of the state of Mississippi is laid down by Judge Stroud in the following terms:

"The emancipation must be an *instrument in writing*, a last will or deed, &c., *under seal* attested by at least *two credible witnesses* or *acknowledged in the court* of the county or corporation where the emancipator resides; *proof satisfactory to the General Assembly* must be adduced that the slave has done *some meritorious act for the benefit of his master*, or rendered *some distinguished service to the State*; all which circumstances are but *pre-requisites*, and are of no efficacy until a special *Act of Assembly* sanctions the emancipation; to which may be added, as has been already stated, a saving of the *rights of creditors*, and the protection of the *widow's thirds*."

The same *pre-requisite* of "*meritorious services*, to be adjudicated on and allowed by the County Court," is exacted by an Act of the General Assembly of North Carolina; and all slaves emancipated contrary to the provisions of this Act are to be committed to the jail of the county, and at the next court held for that county to be sold to the highest bidder.

The law of North Carolina adds this clause:

"The sheriff is directed, five days before the time for the sale of the *emancipated* negro, to give notice, in writing, to the person by whom the emancipation was made, to the end that such person may, if he thinks proper, renew his claim to the negro so emancipated by him; on failure to do which, the sale is to be made by the sheriff, and one-fifth part of the net proceeds is to become the property of the freeholder by whom the apprehension was made, and the remaining four-fifths are to be paid into the public treasury."

Nor is this legislation an inoperative one. Mrs. Beecher Stowe gives from the public papers the following case:

"A man of the name of Elisha Brazealle, a planter in Jefferson County, Mississippi, was attacked with a loathsome disease. During

his illness he was faithfully nursed by a mulatto slave, to whose assiduous attentions he felt that he owed his life. He was duly impressed by her devotion, and soon after his recovery took her to Ohio, and had her educated. She was very intelligent, and improved her advantages so rapidly that when he visited her again he determined to marry her. He executed a deed for her emancipation, and had it recorded both in the States of Ohio and Mississippi, and made her his wife.

"Mr. Brazealle returned with her to Mississippi, and in process of time had a son. After a few years he sickened and died, leaving a will, in which, after reciting the deed of emancipation, he declared his intention to ratify it, and devised all his property to this lad, acknowledging him in the will to be his son.

"Some poor and distant relations in North Carolina, whom he did not know, and for whom he did not care, hearing of his death, came on to Mississippi, and claimed the property thus devised. They instituted a suit for its recovery, and the case (it is reported in Howard's Mississippi Reports, vol. ii. p. 837.) came before Judge Sharkey, our new consul at Havana. He decided it, and in that decision declared the act of emancipation *an offence against morality*, and pernicious and detestable as an example. He set *aside the will; gave the property of Brazealle to his distant relations, condemned Brazealle's son, and his wife*, that son's mother, again to bondage, and made them the slaves of these North Carolina kinsmen, as part of the assets of the estate."

Chief Justice Sharkey observes, that although, according to principles of national comity, "contracts are to be construed according to the laws of the country or state where they are made," yet these principles are not to be followed when they lead to conclusions in conflict with "the great and fundamental policy of the State." He then continues:

"Let us apply these principles to the deed of emancipation. To give it validity would be, in the first place, a violation of the declared policy, and contrary to a positive law of the State.

"The policy of the State is indicated by the general course of legislation on a given subject; and we find that free negroes are deemed offensive, because they are not permitted to emigrate or to remain in the State.

"The state of the case shows conclusively that the contract had its origin in an offence against morality, pernicious and detestable as

an example. But, above all, it seems to have been planned and executed with a fixed design to evade the rigour of the laws of this State."

Now, passing over the gross Pharisaism of the moral remark, I am afraid all this is good law; but, for this very reason, it condemns the law. Nobody denies that a change of the law must be left to the State legislatures; but no free heart, unawed by Lynch Law, and not warped by national susceptibility, will allow that the system is compatible with a profession of Christianity. Such an inroad both upon the liberty of the individual citizen and the dictates of Christianity can be explained, but it can never be justified. It is unparalleled in the history of the world. It is put to shame by the Roman Catholic Colonies, and how could it consist with the Gospel? If we ask Christ and the Apostles and the ancient Christians, they tell us unanimously, that the rest must be left to the quiet but irresistible working of the spirit of Christianity in a Christian people. Faith in that spirit is required from the opponents of the present system as well as from its abettors. I will not conceal the fact that my own faith in the power of that spirit, among a nation conspicuous for so much Christian feeling and moral earnestness, remains unshaken. But I will also not refrain from saying, with the earnestness of a historian and with the sincerity of a Christian, that the eyes of all nations are upon the people of the United States, as to what they will do on this point at this moment. It rests with them to belie the doubts of those who do not believe in their national morality, and to give to the world an example of the reality of their liberty, and of the sincerity of their Christian profession. The greater the Christian vocation of a nation is, the higher and the more difficult the problem will be which it must solve — or perish. All nations fall morally before they perish politically; republican nations before all others; and there are already distressing signs which show the baneful influence of the system, even beyond the Slave States. The moral oppression of the coloured people in the free-labour States is one of those distressing symptoms. Such a state of things warps the judgment of

American writers even in philosophical and historical researches, and renders that great but absolute nation more susceptible as to any frank Christian discussion of this their dark point, than despotic princes usually are when their system of dynastic absolutism is attacked. In the meantime, it must never be forgotten, that even now slavery is the exception, free labour the rule; and that the letter and spirit of the Constitution are in as glaring contradiction to that exceptional evil of State Legislation, as the latter is to the Gospel and the whole history of Christianity.

Without prying into the secrets of Providence, one may reasonably believe that the great destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race in the other hemisphere cannot be fulfilled in all its extent and glory, until the coloured race, christianized and educated for municipal liberty, starts with the moral energy of the father, and the bodily aptitude of the mother, into those parts of the American continent, where the Anglo-Saxon cannot work, and therefore not live worthy of himself, and where the two races which now hold it, the Indian and the Spanish, are withering away or dying in convulsions.

Whatever is in the plan of Eternal Providence, must be done, and will be done. The laws of the moral government of the world are as irresistible as the physical laws of the universe. The only option which nations have is to become the willing or the unwilling instruments of this eternal order; to rise by fulfilling its decrees, or to be crushed by its wheels when in the progress of ages they pass over what is in their way; to live in the annals of mankind as a blessing to future generations, or as a curse for all times to come.

NOTES

TO

THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION.

TO THE FIRST BOOK (BAPTISM).

NOTE A. p. 114.

THE THREE PASSAGES OF ORIGEN ABOUT THE BAPTISM OF LITTLE CHILDREN.

In Ep. ad Rom. V. (Opp. iv. p. 565., speaking of the corpus peccati): "Ideo et ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant illi, quibus Christianorum secreta commissa sunt mysteriorum, quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et spiritum ablui deberent."

In Levit. Homil. VIII. (Opp. ii. p. 230.): "Addi his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit cum baptisma ecclesiæ pro remissione peccatorum detur, secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dare: cum utique, si nihil esset in parvulis, quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur."

In Lucam Homil. XIV. (Opp. iii. p. 948.): "Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quorum peccatorum? vel quo tempore peccaverunt? aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi juxta illum sensum, de quo paulo ante diximus: 'Nullus mundus a sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram?' Et quia per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli: 'Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu, non poterit intrare in regnum cœlorum.'"

Note B. p. 127.

LITURGICAL FORMULARIES OF THE GERMAN LUTHERAN CHURCHES FOR CONFIRMATION.

I. *According to the "Allgemeines evangelisches Gesang- und Gebetbuch, Hamburg,* 1846," *compiled from the Austrian Agenda* (1576), *and other authorized Liturgies of the* 16*th and* 17*th Centuries.*

Alternate Chant of Choir and Congregation, Psalm xxxiv.:

I will alway give thanks unto the Lord:
His praise shall ever be in my mouth, &c.

(Or the Veni Sancte Spiritus, chanted by the Choir or Congregation, "Komm heiliger Geist erfüll die Herzen":)

Come Holy Ghost,
Fulfil the hearts of Thy believers,
And kindle in them the fire of Thy divine Love;
Thou who through the manifoldness of tongues
Hast gathered the nations of the whole earth
In unity of faith:
Hallelujah! Hallelujah!

(Then the Minister shall address the People, either in a free exhortation, or according to the Liturgy of the Austrian Agenda of 1571:)

Beloved in the Lord!

Ye see here before you these children our fellow-heirs in Christ, who through holy baptism have been in their childhood grafted into the Lord Christ and into His holy Church. But inasmuch as they have been led to inquire into the knowledge of Christian doctrine and of godliness, they now desire with all their heart to be allowed to approach more truly, more fully, and more closely to our and their Saviour Jesus Christ, and to His holy Church; that is, by the use of the Holy Supper and Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Now in order that this may be done with greater effect, and to the strengthening of their faith by the Holy Ghost, so that for the rest of their lives it may be to their health in Christ and turn to their good, it becometh us that we should pray God our Heavenly Father, in the name of Christ, that He would mercifully grant them hereto His grace and the help of the Holy Spirit, that henceforth our Lord

Christ may more richly dwell in them, and they in Christ; that they may daily increase in faith, love, and patience, together with all the fruits of the Holy Spirit; that they may be furthered in them, and therein abide unto the end, and be saved.

In order that they may attain unto this, I beseech you to pray with me in full trust in the name of Jesus:

Our Father which art in Heaven, &c.

(The Minister shall then say:)

Beloved in the Lord!

In ancient times it was a custom that they who were grown up should first learn the chief points of Christian doctrine, and after they had been sufficiently instructed therein, they renounced, before baptism, themselves, the devil, the world and its works, and were accordingly baptized. Then prayer was made for them, with the laying on of hands, that they might receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, in order that through His grace and mighty working they should be confirmed and strengthened in the knowledge of the truth of the Gospel of Christ, to confess the same without fear, more particularly in the time of persecution, so that they might more and more increase from day to day in faith and love, and in all Christian virtues and the fruits of the Spirit, and be continually preserved in Christ and in His grace through the Holy Spirit, as being the earnest of life.

Ye well know, beloved in the Lord, that these children whom ye see standing round (with their parents and sponsors) were baptized into our Church in their infancy, at a time when they could not of their own selves bear witness to or promise anything. They have therefore now assembled here, in order to fulfil, with a joyful heart and with a confession of their faith, all that which in times of old they that were grown up in the Church were accustomed to perform: they are also willing to profess that they have diligently learnt, and do firmly believe, the chief points of the Christian religion in the Church of God, as their sponsors have in their name vowed and promised at holy baptism: finally, they are ready with their own mouths to confess the weakness and infirmity which, according to the flesh, is born in them, "to renounce the devil and the world, and to give up themselves wholly to the Lord Jesus Christ and to His Church, that through the prayer of the Church, and through the right use of the Holy Sacrament they may, like the rest of the faithful, receive increase of the Holy Ghost, and be made partakers of His gifts in the Church of God,

that they may so lead the life which God grants them in this earth, according to the Word of God, as well becometh and befitteth the true followers of Jesus Christ.

Wherefore I earnestly exhort you all that you will be witnesses of this holy profession, which they are now about to make before God and before His Church, and that you will earnestly pray for them: and also that each one of you will diligently attend to everything, and apply it to himself, and so interpret it; remembering how ye yourselves did once likewise make confession of your faith and promise of obedience unto the Church, and how for this reason it should be your duty, after such promise, to order your life to the honour of God and the bettering of your neighbour, and to follow the exhortation of the Lord Jesus Christ, when he saith, "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

(Or the Minister may use the following instead:)

My Christian Friends!

We have great reason to give hearty thanks to God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone beginneth and accomplisheth every good work, that He hath presented these children to His Church, that He hath accepted them in holy baptism, and now hath so far enlightened them, that they themselves have come to the knowledge of this His great mercy and goodness, and of their redemption in Christ Jesus, His beloved Son, our Lord, and are now ready to profess the same before the congregation.

(Then the Minister turning to the Children, shall say:)

And as for you, my dear children, both sons and daughters, ye must also give thanks and praise to God, that He hath blessed you so highly from your birth and baptism, through your parents, sponsors, and friends (who now at this hour are presenting you to God and to His congregation), and beseech Him that He may continue to bless you, if so be that ye remain faithful, and grow and increase in faith.

I exhort you therefore, through Jesus Christ, that ye fulfil with willing mind that which it becometh you to do, and that ye give an answer to the questions which I shall put to you, not only with an audible voice, but also with a devout mind, and in the fear of God the Lord, who is a witness and a judge of your thoughts, resolves, words, and promises.

(Then the Minister shall hold an)

Examination in the chief Points of the Christian Faith.

(After this Examination the Minister shall proceed as follows:)

My dear Children!

Now that ye have proved how that ye have been sufficiently and suitably instructed in the alone saving truth of the Word of God, ye shall solemnly declare also at this time, before God and this congregation, that ye have not only heard this doctrine from your teacher, but are ready to profess it as your own faith before God and man; and that ye are willing to affirm, and to keep as your own vow, the vow which was made for you at holy baptism. Let, then, the congregation hear you make, with devout and joyful heart, your confession, such as the universal Christian Church hath professed at all times, and all true believers have sealed in life and death, and so devoutly say after me,

I believe in God the Father Almighty, &c.

(to the end of the *Apostles' Creed*, the Children repeating each sentence after the Minister.)

(Then shall the Minister go on to say:)

Minister. Do ye now profess, before the face of the living God, this our Christian faith, and will ye abide therein, and order your whole life accordingly, and die therein?

Children. Yea, so we will, with all our heart, by the help of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Minister and People. Amen.

Minister. Do ye renounce the devil, with all his works and ways? Do ye renounce the world, with all its pomps and vanities? Do ye renounce all fleshly lusts and desires, so that ye will not allow them to have dominion over you, nor yourselves serve the law which is in your members?

Children. Yea, we renounce them all.

Minister and People. Amen.

Minister. Do ye then vow that ye will give up yourselves to obey Christ, and henceforth to live and to do according to your faith and profession, and faithfully to keep what ye here have promised?

Children. Yea, so we will, by the grace and help of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Minister and People. Amen.

Minister. On this your profession and vow, I receive you, in virtue of my office as ordained Minister of the Word of God, and in the face of this congregation, into the full communion of the Church, and bestow upon you all the rights, benefits, and gifts which our Lord Jesus Christ hath won and given to the faithful members of His congregation; and I do this in the name of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost! Amen.

Choir and People. Amen.

Minister. Kneel down and receive the blessing of the Lord.

(Then laying his hand on the head of each Child he shall say:)

Receive ye the Holy Ghost,
A guard and shield from all evil,
The strength and help to all good,
From the gracious hand of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Choir. Amen. Amen. Amen.

(Or this:)

God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost give thee His grace, a guard and shield from all evil, the strength and help to all good, for the precious merit's sake of our only Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Choir. Amen. Amen. Amen.

(While the Confirmation is proceeding, the Choir shall sing the following:)

Receive ye the Holy Ghost,
A guard and shield from all evil,
The strength and help to all good,
From the gracious hand of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Choir. Amen. Amen. Amen.

Minister. Let us pray.

O Lord Jesu Christ, Son of God, who hast said, "If ye who are evil know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him;" and, "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven:" we pray Thee, strengthen these children with Thy Holy Spirit, that they may ever remain in the obedience of Thy gospel, that they may manfully fight against sin, the world, and the devil, nor grieve the Holy Spirit, nor wound Thy Holy Church by any offence

of theirs ; but that their lives may serve to Thy praise, to their own salvation, and the bettering of others, as Thou hast ordered and also hast promised us. Amen.

(Or this :)

O Lord God, Heavenly Father, who through Thine unspeakable wisdom and righteousness hast hidden the mystery of Thy kingdom from the wise of this world, and hast manifested it to babes, we all give Thee hearty thanks for Thy great goodness, by which Thou hast enabled these children to come to such excellent knowledge, that they have not only believed from their hearts, but also confessed with their mouths, Thy Son Jesus Christ, and the truth of the Gospel: we humbly and earnestly beseech Thee that Thou wouldest further enlighten and strengthen their hearts and minds through Thy Holy Spirit, that they being gifted with true and lively faith, with the fear of God and with stedfastness, also having a good understanding in all spiritual things, may more and more proceed from day to day in all that is good for their salvation, and also may bring forth the fruits of faith and love to the honour of Thy holy Name, and therein continually and victoriously abide until that day when all they that have fought well and manfully shall receive the crown of righteousness through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth world without end. Amen.

(Then the Minister, turning to the Congregation, shall say :)

Beloved in the Lord!

Ye have heard with your own ears the good and Christian profession and vow made by these children : and inasmuch as prayer hath been offered up for them by the whole Church, it is certain that the Lord will accept such prayer, made in His Name ; and accordingly these children may be duly admitted, with all other faithful people, to the supper of Jesus Christ. It will be then your part and duty to acknowledge them as dear children of God in Christ Jesus, as your brethren, nearest of kin, as joint heirs with yourselves and with the Lord. Wherefore I commend them most earnestly to your keeping, that ye may be ready to show them every Christian service and love, in body and soul, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

(After this a Hymn shall be sung. The following verse is usually chosen, "Lass mich dein sein und bleiben" :

Let me be Thine for ever,
Thou good and faithful Lord!

Nor world nor sin me sever
From Thee and Thy dear Word:
Keep me, O Lord, and raise me
With Thine own arm; then I
With heart and mind will praise Thee,
Through all eternity.)

(Then the Minister shall say:)

The God of peace sanctify you throughly, and may your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ! Faithful is He who calleth you, who also will do it. Amen.

Choir. Amen. Amen. Amen.

II. *The Order of Confirmation, as agreed upon for the German Congregation at Jerusalem.*

(A hymn shall be sung by the People, after which the Minister shall say:)

Our help cometh from the Lord: who hath made heaven and earth.

Dearly beloved in the Lord!

Ye see here before you these children, fellow-heirs with us in Christ, and by holy baptism grafted into the body of Christ and received into His Church. They have been, since that time, frequently reminded of the baptismal covenant, instructed in the discipline of the Gospel, and of late fully taught the Christian doctrine of salvation. They desire now to be received into its fullest communion, as true soldiers of Christ, and to participate in all the graces which the Lord promises to His faithful people in His Holy Communion; and as a sure witness of this their godly desire, they offer now to give account of their faith publicly before God and this Christian congregation, and to renew by a solemn vow and profession the covenant into which they entered in baptism, to the end that they may be presented to the Bishop, and allowed to receive the blessing of the Church given through his hands, and then be admitted to the Holy Communion, as the seal of such vow and blessing.

Wherefore I exhort you all, in the name of God, that you will give heed to this examination, and to the testimony which they are about to give of their faith, with an attentive and devout mind.

And as for you, my dear Children, I exhort you now, to give with all readiness account of that which you have learnt, with good confidence and lively faith in your dear Saviour and Mediator, who hath promised, saying, "Lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

(Then the Minister shall hold an)

Examination.

(This being concluded, he shall go on to say:)

My dear Children! &c., as above, unto the end of the service.

(After which shall follow the Order of Confirmation, according to the English Prayer-book, beginning with "Our help is in the Name of the Lord," &c. unto the end.)

Bishop. Our help is in the Name of the Lord:
Answer. Who hath made heaven and earth.
Bishop. Blessed be the Name of the Lord:
Answer. Henceforth, world without end.
Bishop. Lord, hear our prayers.
Answer. And let our cry come unto Thee.

The Bishop. Let us pray.

Almighty and everliving God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these Thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins; strengthen them, we beseech Thee, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter, and daily increase in them Thy manifold gifts of grace; the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength; the spirit of knowledge and true godliness; and fill them, O Lord, with the spirit of Thy holy fear, now and for ever. Amen.

(Then all of them in order kneeling before the Bishop, he shall lay his hand upon the head of every one severally, saying:)

Defend, O Lord, this Thy servant, with Thy heavenly grace, that He may continue Thine for ever, and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more, until he come into Thy everlasting kingdom. Amen

(Then shall the Bishop say:)

The Lord be with you.
Answer. And with Thy spirit.

(And all kneeling down, the Bishop shall add:)

Let us pray.

Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name. Thy Kingdom come. Thy Will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil. Amen.

(And this Collect:)

Almighty and everliving God, who makest us both to will and to do those things that be good and acceptable unto Thy Divine Majesty; we make our humble supplications unto Thee for these Thy servants, upon whom (after the example of Thy holy Apostles) we have now laid our hands, to certify them (by this sign) of Thy favoured gracious goodness towards them. Let Thy Fatherly hand, we beseech Thee, ever be over them. Let Thy Holy Spirit ever be with them, and so lead them in the knowledge and obedience of Thy Word, that in the end they may obtain everlasting life, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

O Almighty Lord and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech Thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern both our hearts and bodies in the ways of Thy laws, and in the works of Thy commandments; that through Thy most mighty protection both here and ever we may be preserved in body and soul, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

(Then the Bishop shall bless them, saying thus:)

The blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be upon you, and remain with you for ever. Amen.

TO THE SECOND BOOK (THE CONSTITUTION).

NOTE C. p. 142.

THE HISTORY OF THE 20TH ARTICLE IN THE ENGLISH ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

THE words quoted, with which the 20th Article at present begins (in the Latin text, "Habet Ecclesia ritus statuendi jus et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem"), are not in the authentic Latin copy which bears the original signatures of the bishops in the Synod of 1562, when the Articles of Edward VI. were definitely settled ; nor in the document of the Convocation of 1571, also signed by the bishops: nor are they found in the English editions of Jugg and Cawood, of 1563; nor in the Latin and English editions published under the direction of bishop Jewel in 1571. They are first found in the Latin edition of Wolfe in 1571, and occasionally in subsequent editions until the time of archbishop Laud, who had them inserted in all the authorized copies. Laud was beheaded: the republican Revolution overthrew the whole Church: the Restoration ratified and reestablished this spurious text of the Article. The Revolution of 1689, which introduced real constitutional liberty, made that text practically a dead letter, which circumstance may explain the fact, that its spuriousness has never been made, either at that period, or subsequently, the subject of discussion.

The key to the whole insertion is in the remarkable addition made in Wolfe's edition of 1563, in which that clause first appeared. There, namely, are added the following words of the royal sanction: "Quibus omnibus articulis Serenissima Princeps Elizabeth, &c., PER SEIPSAM prius lectis et examinatis, Regium suum assensum præbuit."

The late dean of Bristol, Dr. John Lamb, to whom we owe the documentary proof of this curious transaction (in his book, "An historical Account of the Thirty-nine Articles, from their first Promulgation in 1553 to their final Establishment in 1571," 1829, 4to.), shows (p. 33.) that the copy of the Articles, as decreed in the Convocation of 1562, remained with the Queen for about a year, during which period the clause was added by Her Majesty. I have no doubt it was done in council, through the ready instrumentality of Cecil, but that it emanated from her own individual will. She was resolved to govern the Church, at least as much as the Pope had done.

TO THE THIRD BOOK (THE CHURCH LITURGY).

Note D. p. 173.

WORKS ON THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AND ON LITURGIES IN GENERAL, REFERRED TO.

For the text of the English Liturgies, I have used the second (more correct) edition of the Rev. *William Keeling's* "Liturgiæ Britannicæ" (1851, in which the Thirty-nine Articles are omitted) and the "Reliquiæ Liturgicæ" of the Rev. *Peter Hall* (in 5 vols. Bath, 1847). As to the Liturgies of the Scotch Episcopal Church, I have compared the text reprinted in the "Fragmenta Liturgica" of the same author (1848), with the "Office for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with a preliminary Dissertation," by the Rev. *John Skinner* (Aberdeen, 1807, 8vo.), son of bishop Skinner, author of the "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," with which work that of Macrie is to be compared. I have obtained much information as to the rather obscure history of this text from the "Address to the Members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland by a Layman" (supposed to be Lord Medwyn, a Scotch judge), kindly communicated to me by the Right Hon. W. Gladstone. Daniel's text is, on the whole, very correct, and the arrangement sensible: but the relation of the Scotch and American Communion Services to each other cannot be made out of it with exactness. Upon the Liturgy of the Episcopal Church in the United States, I have used the edition of Brownell (1823, 4to.), with a learned commentary: upon the Hymn-book, the most recent editions published in Pennsylvania and New York. The distinguished historical work of the Right Rev. Bishop Wilberforce, alluded to in the concluding chapter, is entitled, "History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America" (1844; 2nd edition, 1845, 8vo.). As to the Constitutional Law of the Church of England, the works of the Rev. William Goode, referred to, bear the titles: "The Doctrine of the Church of England on Non-Episcopal Ordination" (Nov. 1851, 8vo.): and, "A Reply to the Bishop of Exeter's second Arraignment of his Metropolitan" (1852). As to the term "Church of Scotland" in the LVth Canon, see his "Reply to Archdeacon Churton," &c., and, generally, the recent new edition of "The Rule of Faith."

I take this opportunity of apologizing for not quoting more accurately the rare book mentioned when treating of the German Service of Confirmation as "the Austrian Agenda of 1571." I possessed a fine copy of this most spirited and very rare Liturgy of Austria under the Ens, printed at Linz, in 1571, and known as being principally the work of Chrytæus. I have made more use of this Agenda than of any other in my "Gesang- und Gebetbuch" of 1846: but I must have lent it since to one of my literary friends who take an interest in my very complete collection of ancient and modern Agenda and Hymn-books (about 500 volumes), and that friend must have forgotten to return it. It is probably the only copy of this rare book in England.

PART III.

THE

APOLOGY OF HIPPOLYTUS,

ADDRESSED TO THE

PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

CHRISTIANO AUGUSTO BRANDISIO

VIRO SOCRATICO

PHILOSOPHO CHRISTIANO

AMICO CARISSIMO

IN TUSCULANARUM DISPUTATIONUM MEMORIAM

D. D. D.

Γλυκὺ τὸ συμφιλολογεῖν καὶ συμφιλοσοφεῖν.

THE

APOLOGY OF HIPPOLYTUS,

ADDRESSED TO

THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

A SPEECH

DELIVERED

IN LONDON, BEFORE A COMPANY OF FRIENDS,

ON THE IDES OF AUGUST, MDCCCLI.

BEING THE

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPOSITION OF THE REMAINS OF
SAINT HIPPOLYTUS IN THE CATACOMBS OF THE AGER VERANUS,
ON THE TIBURTINE ROAD,

ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTEEN YEARS
AFTER HIS MARTYRDOM.

THE

APOLOGY OF HIPPOLYTUS.

I CAN assure you, my Christian Friends and my enlightened Judges, it is with the greatest diffidence that I venture to address you in my own defence, and claim your protection and interference. Not that I have any misgiving as to your justice and fairness, when you know the real state of the case: nor is the case in itself a difficult one; but it is prejudged. My book has been taken away from me, because the very existence of a Roman Hippolytus is doubted; and I am thought an apocryphal person, because, most of my other works being lost, this, which bears so unequivocal a proof of my having been a Roman, is said to be written by any one rather than by me. In like manner, my book is not studied, because it seems doubtful who wrote it; and the authorship is doubtful, merely because it is not studied. There are other and deeper reasons for my diffidence, which I will tell you by and by.

Under these circumstances, I know of no better way than to throw myself upon your indulgence, and to tell you with Christian frankness what has happened to me. I want encouragement at your hands; for I am a stranger and an ill-used man, and I feel perplexed and despondent.

Some time ago the Spirit moved me to go to Lugdunum, once the seat of my blessed master Irenæus, in order to examine on the spot the strange stories I had heard of his flock, and of the doctrine of his successor, now member of that same body of suburban bishops and parish priests and deacons of Rome, to which I once belonged. But hearing that my book, the work of my life, had been published here as the composition of Origen, I hastened to this country.

Now, consider first what interest I have at stake in this cause. I appear before you to reclaim my property, that is to say, all I ever possessed, save and except my good conscience. For when I speak of my property, I mean, not only the book which I wrote with great labour, and out of love to God-loving men, such as you are, but also my reputation as a scholar and learned divine; and last, though not least, my good Christian name in history. And the reason of all this is, that my very existence as a presbyter at Rome and as bishop of Portus is questioned, or rather given up altogether, in this country at least. It is doubted whether I, Hippolytus, ever was bishop of Portus and lived at Rome; and I am doomed to hear these doubts thrown out, after having led a long, and not only a laborious, but also a highly honoured, life in the city which was then the metropolis of the world, and in the midst of inquisitive foreigners flowing to Portus from the East and West; after having enjoyed a literary reputation unequalled in my Church, and after having sealed my faith by confessing Christ during a cruel persecution.

So much for the paramount importance of the case to myself. Then look at the injustice and partiality which apparently have been shown in the proceedings. An ingenious man comes from the Gauls, and requests a very learned body of men to allow a book discovered by him to be printed by the press of the university under Origen's name. Now, had they read the book, these men, I think, could not have helped seeing that it must have been written at Rome, and by a man in authority resident there. Moreover Origen, my illustrious Alexandrian friend, never said that he had composed a book with such a title, or on such a subject; nor has any body else ever said it of him, so far as I can learn. On the other hand, all the ancient authors and records of ecclesiastical history which have come down to you name me, I am assured, as the author of a work with that title; and one of them gives you a pretty good account of it. Those learned men, therefore, knowing, of course, all this, ought in fairness, as it appears to me, to have called upon the ingenious Celt to prove to them why they should believe an unknown, and probably ignorant copyist, rather than all the records of antiquity, and their own impartial judgment. But they did

nothing of the sort. For, to judge from the preface which the editor has prefixed to this book in the language of the Romans, either they did not ask him to satisfy their minds on this point, or he satisfied them with reasons known to himself, but unknown to the rest of the world, and to me certainly quite impenetrable Now I do not quarrel with them for this exceeding courtesy towards the Gallic editor. But I do not find the same extended to myself. On the contrary, whenever I come forward and put in my claim as Hippolytus, presbyter of the Church of Rome and bishop of Pòrtus, they say, I am not one person, but two or three, and nobody knows who and what I am.

Still I was not discouraged at first. I said, these men will judge such a case as men of the law, according to law. I have in my favour two clear principles of that Roman civil law, which, I understand, almost all nations have followed, and acknowledge at least as *ratio scripta*, that is, common sense put in writing. Now, I said, they will, I am sure, think it fair to judge the case of a Roman Father by the principles of the Roman law. Consequently they will acknowledge the *jus postliminii*, according to which a Roman is allowed to return to his home without any further proof of his right: why, then, should not I in this manner claim my former existence? Besides, as a Roman, I further say, *Ubi invenio vindico*, Where I find my property I seize it; leaving the man in whose possession I find it to recover damages, if he can, from him who made it over to him.

Seeing, however, that they would not accept the principles of Roman jurisprudence, I addressed them as scholars and divines. Accordingly, I am ready, I said, to give you a full account of the book, and to show you that I have referred in it to other acknowledged works of mine: and, if you listen to me, you will soon understand that I must have written it (as I was universally said to have done), and that nobody at that time could have thought of writing it, except myself. Now what answer did they give me to this? They said, they would rather, as English custom allowed them to do, move the previous question, and first satisfy their minds that there was a man of that name, bishop of Portus and presbyter of Rome, nay, whether at that time there was any Hippolytus in the Western Church,

or, if so, whether there were not more than one. You maintain unequivocally (they added) that you were bishop of Portus near Rome, and lived at Rome: you therefore leave us no power of saying on your behalf that you might possibly be Hippolytus, and even the author of this work, but that you lived in Arabia. You are determined to be a Roman, and a bishop and a presbyter at the same time: and we must demur to this for more than one reason.

Hereupon, I said to myself, if this had happened at Rome, I should have called it not dealing quite fairly with a Father, who surely ought to have some presumption of his existence in his favour: at all events there is in it none of that courtesy which has been shown towards the Gallic editor.

Still I feel I should have overcome these difficulties, if the cause had not been prejudged more than a hundred years ago. It is not the mistake of this Frenchman that has prejudiced the minds of those learned men of yours against me. There are many among them, who are fully convinced that Origen neither wrote the book nor could have written it. But why is this conviction of no avail to me? Alas! there is an old calumny against me, originating in a hasty word altered by a learned Protestant writer, which unfortunately was taken up by some celebrated French priest of that time. And, again, that hasty word (which at the beginning I could not understand) is the consequence of more than a thousand years of lies. For, soon after I died, people began to make of my simple but true story a poetical but lying legend, upon which in the barbarous ages every one improved as he pleased. Learned rogues wrote silly or deceitful books under my name, and learned fools believed them to be genuine. Thus it came to pass, that the learned men of those countries where I once lived, being disabled from dealing honestly with historical truth, and from calling a fable a fable and a lie a lie, tried to reconcile all the nursery-tales and fictions which had been brought forward and credited during those dark ages. This, as you see, was simply betraying truth; for you cannot believe fables, without disbelieving the truth to which they are opposed. Thus, by laying down that there must have been two or three Hippolytuses, they lost the only real Hippolytus: and I am he.

Who can tell which was which? said one person. But another said, he had a guess. There might be some truth in the old report, that the Hippolytus who lived in the time of Alexander Severus was bishop of Portus: for almost all the authors who mentioned him, said so. But why should not this be Aden in Arabia, which was called the Port of the Romans, or the Roman Port? This man of course did not advert to the circumstance, that my home was never so called, but unequivocally the Port of Rome, or Portus near Rome: still less did he mind all the absurdities he involved himself in by compounding between truth and fable, or the doubt which he threw upon history.

So said those Gallic priests, about 150 years ago. Not long afterwards came an English divine, and made the matter worse. He positively asserted, as if it were a settled point, that I was a native of Arabia, and a bishop of that remote Eastern country, and that this was all any one could know about me personally. Now he certainly was a very learned man, and a dean besides: and he enjoys in this country so high a reputation, that it is to his book, I understand, that those in your country, who want to know what people once thought on these subjects of ancient Christian criticism, now recur. However that may be, it is clear that what has prejudged my case is not what the Gallic editor has said, but that old unconscionable judgment, based upon a conjecture; and that this conjecture again was based upon fables and lies, which sprang from a neglect of true historical criticism, and from a want of faith in truth, not to say a contempt of truth.

Now I ask you, whether, with all my feeling of my innocence, and with all my confidence in your natural fairness, I can be very hopeful of success. I have chosen this day as being my anniversary, and as having been celebrated thus[1] by many a Christian soul, for more than sixteen centuries: and I should like you to listen to me through a good part of it with attention. But you have no time. At the utmost, you can only give me two hours — two short hours, to undo the work of centuries, to remove unfavourable opinions so deeply rooted in the minds of your learned men, to counteract the effect of a verdict invested in their eyes with the sanction of ages, and to overcome, what is

my most formidable enemy, your indifference! Instead of being taken on my word for what I am recorded to be, I am expected to prove my own existence, as being the real and only Hippolytus, the bishop of Portus and the presbyter of Rome and the author of this book, for which in particular I am come to claim your protection. But, to speak the truth with Christian sincerity, you do not care whether I exist or not, nor what I said or said not. For the truth of this frank assertion, and the justice of my complaint of hardship, let me appeal to yourselves. I know, you are enlightened, and generally well informed men; and many of you deeply read in ecclesiastical antiquity. But, first, have you not come to this place with a vague notion that I am an apocryphal person? Now you must have a misgiving about trusting an apocryphal man with a disputed authorship. You might endanger the authority of a book declared authentic and important, and your own likewise. Besides, I fear, many of you are come to this place with a feeling that it is of no great consequence what the truth of the matter may be at last.

Such being my case, I hope, during the two short hours allowed for my defence, you will listen to me attentively, as being a deeply injured man, and that, hearing me for the first time on this day, you will not be satisfied till you have sifted my case thoroughly. Above all, I trust you will not forget that we are searching for truth, for historical and religious truth; and I can prove to you that the case you have to investigate is connected with the most important subjects on which it is given to man to meditate, and last, not least, with your highest practical interests. I claim no copyright; I appeal to no point of law; I call upon you to investigate truth, and truth very important for your present and future wellbeing.

I have not concealed from you the weighty causes of my diffidence, which sometimes grows into despondency. But I should be more sorry still, if I had to fear you would imagine that this despondency is founded upon any doubt as to your competency for finding out the truth, or as to your justice towards strangers. I know that you possess all the means requisite for investigating a historical fact, and for distinguishing between good and bad evidence. I know, besides, that you are the fairest of men, kind

to foreigners, and generous to all who in distress appeal to you. My only misgiving is this, that, having for a long time deferred all these questions and inquiries to some learned bodies, one of which is apparently inclined the other way, and having, in the midst of so many more practical avocations, no time and little inclination to trouble yourselves about what the old Fathers said or did or were, you may decline to judge my case, as one which ought to be judged by those whose office it is to read the old Fathers.

Hear, then, my reasons, why it is by you, my Christian Friends, that I wish to be judged in preference to all others. My case is a very simple one, if you divest it of theological terms and subtleties. To be well understood, all that it demands is, that spirit of fairness, and that common sense, for which all nations give you credit, and for which I see you are indeed entitled to be praised. I perceive that whatever you really care for, and take in hand as a nation, you soon master, however difficult the task may be; and then handle it with great wisdom and superior judgment, and carry out your decision with unrivalled energy and perseverance. I have traversed Romanized Gaul, and seen learned but distracted Germany. In both countries I have met with much to admire and praise: but in that which must depend upon practical wisdom and judgment, I have found nothing worthy to be compared to your national doings. I have seen your shores, and your magnificent river with the forest of masts upon it, leaving far behind it all I ever beheld in sailing up the Tiber from Portus to imperial Rome; I have admired the great palaces and domes along its banks; I have wandered through this metropolis, larger and more populous than Rome ever was; and, finally, I have beheld the Crystal Palace, which is not unequal to the vast buildings raised from time to time on the Campus Martius, and that display of peaceful art and industry, which exhibits so striking a contrast to our shows of military trophies and our bloody games in the amphitheatre. Yet I confess to you with perfect sincerity, that, though I do justice to such works, to your cities and your churches, your iron roads and

your steaming ships, there is something which I admire much more than all this; because I have always thought the cause more worthy of admiration than the effect, and held the moving principle higher than any special manifestation and application of it. What I admire most among you, is what I consider to be your great and lasting monument in the history of the world. You have created a commonwealth, where two things are united which that great pagan, Tacitus, thought irreconcilable, liberty and government. And if I search into the nature, origin, and growth of this your commonwealth, I find it to be the fruit of true Christian principles, of Christian self-government and mercy. All that striking order and energy which reign in this country, all the wisdom and zeal of your senators and areopagitic judges, the general respect for the law among the people, as well as all those great and mighty external works which people admire so much, seem to me to originate in your truly public, and, let me say, Christian spirit. For Christianity is intended to establish law and self-government, first in every individual, next in domestic life, and in public society. Christianity is to convince people of the eternal love of God, and to make them love their fellow-creatures as brethren, in order to enable them, through such love, to erect a godlike, rational, and just, and consequently a free commonwealth. Wherever, therefore, I find the forms of public liberty, I inquire first, whether the people have the law in themselves; whether there be in them, individually, liberty, which is self-government, and charity, which is mutual faith: and where I find that to be the case, I know from history and my own experience that it is the work of Christianity. Now with you this is so, evidently.

And this reminds me of the strange words which I was obliged to hear from the present successor of the blessed Irenæus[2] when I told him, after a short visit, that I intended to go to England and to live some time among you. "I beg your pardon," he said, "for speaking thus freely to one, who asserts himself to be, and who (I am most willing to believe) is, not only a colleague of mine, a cardinal, but also as such is so infinitely my senior, and stands before me indisputably as the Dean of the Sacred College.[3] But I must confess to you, that,

after all that has come to pass in that island during these last three hundred years, and all that they have done lately to a colleague of ours, it appears strange to me that you should wish to go to England. You say you are anxious to know what these Protestants really are; and I understand you were always very inquisitive: but you have only to look at what they did in the ages when their priests were united with us, and to compare it with what they have achieved since their separation, during these last three hundred years, in order to know what to think of their Christianity. The ages in which our Churches were united produced among them saints like yourself, and covered the face of their country with magnificent temples; but since they separated from us, what have they given to the world save money-making men of business, and egotistical statesmen, and what have they reared except factories and cotton-mills?"[4] Then he went on exalting all that the great Roman Catholic nations had done, and lamenting how low you were sunk; and finally he tried to frighten me by saying, he knew through his infallible reporters and their friends in high places, that the Exhibition would be the signal for revolution and murder.

But, doubting much of what he said, I persisted in my resolution, and came over to your country. And here I see that you have indeed erected most wonderful factories and cotton-mills; but you do not make the poor people, men and women and children, work in them on Sundays, as the Gauls do in their country. You have, like them, labourers and mechanics, aspiring to better their condition; but yours prefer working, and quietly associating together, to the making of revolutions, and plunging others and themselves into misery. You have ragged children: but you clothe and educate them for useful work, instead of enlisting them as soldiers to kill their fellow-citizens; and they like learning to read and to work, rather than making an attempt to convulse society by their votes, and to subvert order by arms. Your metropolis is not a monumental town, like a part of theirs: but your monument is your commonwealth. I must apply to you as a nation, what you say in your great basilica on the tomb of the great architect who raised it: "*Si monumentum requiris circumspice.*" You have raised, in

those three hundred years, that well-balanced commonwealth to which I have already alluded, and you have established and maintained such a sanctuary of liberty as even our fathers did not possess in the great and glorious times of the Republic. You have known how to unite freedom with order, popular rights with a national aristocracy and hereditary monarchy, which union, our great heathen prophet Cicero said, would, if ever it could be brought to pass, form the most perfect of governments.[5] This great monument, which you have erected, I admire more than all those outer works of civilization of which other people think you are so proud, not only as men of your race, but as Christians, and, I am bound to add, as Protestants. You have just shown to the world the practical effect of the principle on which your social arrangements are based. People on the Continent believed (or tried to make others believe) that the gathering of so many hundreds of thousands of your working and labouring men round the spectacle of the Great Exhibition would be the signal, if not of famine and pestilence, certainly of revolution and bloodshed. But I have seen them surround their queen with respectful affection: and, far from any disturbance taking place, good-will and good-humour and plenty never have reigned more paramount any where than during these months among you. Now when I ask myself, how long you have possessed this liberty and enjoyed this peace and tranquillity, I cannot help remarking that you owe it all to that godly reform you began to make of Christianity about three hundred years ago. Nor is this an isolated instance: for I find that more or less it is so everywhere; and I know only too well what I have seen in France, and what I have credibly heard here of the state of my native country. In framing your Constitution, you have only applied with consistency and success to politics the great principle of Protestantism, namely, self-responsibility. For liberty is self-government, and self-government is impossible without the principle of moral self-responsibility being the active popular principle of faith. The great work of your Reformation is the State herself, and the progress of society by reform, and not by revolution, and this I find prevalent only in Protestant countries.

This, then, being the impression your nation and country have made upon me, you cannot doubt of my entire confidence in your competency as well as in your justice. Every thing seems to depend upon this, whether I succeed in overcoming your disheartening indifference, and in interesting you in the truth involved in my case. I have a hope I shall succeed, as soon as you convince yourselves that it is not so much my personal case, as that of truth, and therefore your own; as soon as you perceive how intimately it is connected with the earliest development of that pure evangelical faith, to which you cling with such instinctive earnestness and ardour.

My only difficulty, then, at last, is that you have no time for such matters. I confess that there are many circumstances which inspire me with hope also on this point. For you have evidently become more aware in these latter times than you were before, that it is necessary for you to take the religious question, the question of your faith, into your own hands; and I know that, as soon as you do this, you will follow up all those studies and inquiries with which I and my book are connected, and about which I must speak to you in my defence.

But still, as matters stand at present, those whose good opinions I am desirous of deserving, and whom I wish to stir up to some common inquiry respecting the past, present, and future, think very little of us, the old Fathers, and least of all of me, whom their learned men in authority have given up, and struck, as it were, out of their memory. This indifference on the part of your truly learned men frightens me much more than all their attacks and criticisms, past and future. I can say with perfect sincerity that I shall consider it a great honour, if your men of learning criticize me at all; and I shall be grateful to them if they show me the defects and faults of my writings and of my age. For this is the right of the younger and the duty of the wiser. Only do not kill my cause by indifference. All I require from them is, that they sift my case, and above all read my book. I am sure my works, and I myself personally, might have something to tell even to your most learned people. When I meet them privately, I say to myself, it would be preposterous to suppose I could equal such men in knowledge,

wherever they choose to employ their leisure and means of information. But still, in my time we knew something, and I was thought a great luminary, and certainly laboured much to make my fellow Christians equal the heathen in learning and thought, as they surpassed them in virtue and piety. Following up this idea, and thinking how kind they are to foreigners, I perceived a ray of hope in the midst of my despondency. And being thus a little comforted, I felt the blood of a martyr rush back to my heart, and I said to myself, I will take courage. I am put on my defence; and however little I may have known, and much as I may fall short of their divines and philosophers in learning, I know who I am, and that I have written my own book; I also trust I know something of Christ and of the Scriptures, of Christian thought and of Christian life. And after all, am I not among a people known over the whole world as models of fairness? If they have shown, as everybody allows, the strictest impartiality in the difficult task they had undertaken, of being at the same time, like the Eleans of old, among the competitors and among the judges in the Olympic contests, how should they not do so in my case? Above all, since they are Christian brethren, loving Christ, his disciples and followers, how should they not care for me and judge me fairly?

These considerations, as they gave me great comfort at the time, so they now inspire me with cheerful thoughts, with confidence and hope. I feel, at this moment, sure that you will give me a patient hearing; and I promise you to be as short as possible. I will simply tell you what has passed in our academical disputations. Appreciating the manifold disadvantages under which I labour, you will, I am certain, forgive the imperfections of my style, and put the most favourable construction upon my words. You cannot expect me, a foreigner, to be perfect in English idioms, or to know your English forms. I have taken as my model Plato's Apology of Socrates, because I always tried, although very imperfectly, to imitate his style, and to employ the Socratic method as well as I could. Now all this must appear very quaint and strange to you; but be persuaded that it is done without affectation. I do so simply because I do not know better. But above all, you must needs believe

that I am not come to accuse your learned divines, but that I stand before you on my defence, and that I do not mean to teach those who are so much wiser than I am, but to instruct myself. If, therefore, you find that in the course of my apology, in answering their doubts, and in endeavouring to remove their difficulties, I have taken the liberty of asking them a question or two in my turn, I hope you will not consider this too great a liberty, but believe that this method proceeds merely from an earnest desire to improve my stock of knowledge during the time that I have the happiness of living amongst you. Moreover, if in these answers or questions of mine I may appear to have intended to place some puzzles and riddles before them, pray do not think that I delight in paradoxes; but rather believe that I give you only the substance of our conversations, because it is my wish not to be too tedious at the first hearing you grant me, and that I desire to establish a connection with you, which may lead at some future time to more explicit friendly communing between us.

Having thus taken courage to speak frankly to you, and feeling persuaded that you will listen to me with patient attention, I will enter at once upon my defence.

Here you will perhaps fear that I intend to lay before you black-letter records and intricate arguments, in order to prove that I, Hippolytus, was bishop of Portus, and member of the governing presbytery at Rome, and that, as such, I wrote the "Refutation of all the Heresies."

Now I do not intend troubling you with any such proofs. It appears to me absurd that I should be called upon to prove that I am myself; and it makes my head quite giddy to think that it is doubtful whether I am that author. Not understanding anything of the strange stories they so early invented about me, but knowing that they are false, I can with difficulty imagine how men, so wise and enlightened, should ever have arrived at such wild notions and such almost incredible scepticism. A

German friend undertook the other day to explain all this to me, and tried to make me comprehend all the strong arguments which he can bring forward from my book itself, and the good evidence which he has collected from the ancient records about me. I confess that I could not help pitying him for having been obliged to go through so much inquiry, and you for wanting such a circumstantial demonstration in order to believe a fact which ought never to have been doubted. Be sure therefore of this: I will not say a word on this subject; but I will tell you some particulars about Portus and my domestic life in that place, which must prove to you that I lived there, and which will show you how I lived.

I know nothing of that Roman port which they say existed in Arabia, and whither they want to send me into exile. But I know Portus, the harbour, as it were the Piræus, of Rome. You are all acquainted with Ostia, the ancient mouth of the Tiber; and many among you, I dare say, have visited the Holy Island, with its shore of little more than two miles in length from one outlet of the muddy river to the other. Indeed it is from you I have learned how that same island, in my time covered with roses and called a paradise, and crowded by the almost adjoining buildings of Ostia and of Portus, is now a barren spot, haunted by wild buffaloes, and used as a place of transportation, like Sardinia of old. As to Portus itself, they tell me the place bears the old name, but is now no longer a harbour; there is still a pond, I hear, with a few huts round it, constructed, as well as the house of the bishop, which they style a palace, from the ruins of temples and theatres, quays and piers, which place they call Porto, meaning Portus. But I know old Portus. I recollect that on the natural outlet at Ostia having become shallow and impracticable for shipping, one of our early emperors, I forget whether Claudius or Trajan, cut a canal some miles above, which took in a part of the water of the river, and conducted it to a deep and costly basin, surrounded by warehouses, and open to the sea. A flourishing borough had in consequence risen around this new port; and the place, called Portus, became very populous. All ships came there; and all the nations who traded with Rome had their warehouses and

their club-houses and their sanctuaries at Portus. Being by origin a Greek, speaking Greek as my native tongue, and having studied under Irenæus, who taught in Greek, I was considered by the presbytery at Rome and the congregation at Portus to be a proper person to go thither, in spite of the neighbourhood of the city of Ostia. For Greek was the medium, not only of common conversation at the Harbour, but also of religious controversy and of worship. I became instrumental there in doing good. The foreigners liked me; and I was called the Bishop of the Nations. Indeed, I preferred living and conversing with any of them to disputing and living with the Jews. I was a bishop, with the same right as the bishop of Ostia, my neighbour and brother, whose title was older, and who took precedence of me in the presbytery at Rome, but who had little to inspect and to govern, whereas I was really the bishop of the foreigners coming to Rome. By becoming the rector, and therefore the bishop of the Harbour, I did not cease to be a presbyter at Rome, our metropolis, with which we were all connected. Why should I not be both at the same time?

As to my domestic life, it was certainly very unlike what I have seen the successor of Irenæus lead at Lugdunum. I had no court around me; but I had a wife and children, the very mention of which startled that priest, and those about him, whom he called canons. But you, feeling so blessed in your homes, and leading, as far as I can see, very generally, clergy as well as laity, a happy family life, will sympathise with me in what I am going to tell you on this subject.[6]

It was at Portus that I married; and there I lost my ever beloved and only wife, Chloe, the faithful and zealous assistant in what I may call, not only my parochial, but my missionary labours in that noisy port. Her memory is for ever connected with that place. Probably my biographers have not told you, that she was the sister of that rich and influential man, Heron, for a long time my opponent and my rival, as sacristan and fanatical patron of the gaudy and deceitful temple of Serapis at Portus, near the Egyptian warehouse.[7] Let me at all events tell you with humble thankfulness, my labours were at length crowned with success, so that I became instrumental in convert-

ing him to the saving faith of Christ. These were the happiest days of my life. But alas! in the next summer I lost Chloe, in consequence of a fatal fever. My own health having suffered much, I was prevailed upon to reside at Rome. There my bitter controversies began; and my domestic bereavement became complete. In the month of August in the following year I had to weep over the corpse of my beloved son Anteros. He also fell a victim to the fever, having caught it in bishop Callistus' house in the Jews' quarter, on the other side of the Tiber, near the old bridge, whither I had sent him with a message connected with our angry discussions and disputes.[8]

Thus much about myself. You know me now personally. If you wish to know more of me, read my books, and more particularly the one which they have stolen from me.

I therefore think I act fairly towards myself, as well as you, by assuming my own historical existence, as bishop of Portus and presbyter at Rome, as well as my authorship as regards the book in question. Read it, and then ask me any questions you like, and see whether I can answer them, and whether my answers are not such as Hippolytus, who is known to the literary world, might have been expected to give. Let Origen and his friends enjoy the full copyright (for they tell me that this in your country is a very serious matter): I claim only the authorship, and the right to demand that the title of the publication be changed.

Having said thus much about myself personally, I proceed at once to the principal point, which is my reputation as a scholar, a philosopher, a divine, and a Christian. I must treat all these questions separately, one after the other. As you have a right to know what has passed between my learned friends in this country and myself, I think, as I said before, the shortest as well as fairest method will be, to confine myself to relating the substance of our discussions, so far as to enable you to study the case yourselves, and then give your verdict.

Here I must, first of all, give you an account of a discussion on a preliminary point, and a rather ticklish one to settle, which is absolutely necessary for my defence, and for the vindication of my character as a scholar and divine.

In the very outset of my theological discussions in this country on the interpretation of the Scriptures, I found it very difficult to come to a right understanding on the question respecting the text of the sacred volume.

I soon agreed with my Christian friends, when speaking of matters of faith, to take the Holy Scriptures as our common basis. For, as I have said in my treatise against Noetus, without them we should know absolutely nothing[9]; and I can fairly say, that in teaching I have ever declared the Scriptures unequivocally to be the only source of our revealed knowledge of things divine, and of the thought and will of God towards man. This principle I have maintained through life; and on this basis I combated the Gnostic subtleties. You may imagine, therefore, how entirely I agree with your nation, and with the Protestant part of your clergy, on this fundamental point. I have indeed maintained metaphysical points, and opposed philosophical opinions on speculative grounds; but only because the first were, to my mind, necessary or reasonable corollaries from explicit passages of Scripture, and because, on the other hand, those philosophical opinions were in direct opposition to the same. Now, as I thought the Scriptures the basis of our faith, I exhorted the people to read, and tried to help them to understand, what the Bible contains of the word of God. Much, therefore, do I approve and admire your zeal in rendering the Scriptures accessible to all nations; because I am sure this zeal for printing and distributing Bibles is equalled by your more intellectual and effective efforts in instructing the young and the ignorant to understand them, and in preaching the joyful message to all nations by the mouth of evangelists. Having touched upon this point, let me tell you how much I admire the English version of the Scriptures, which seems to me, on the whole, most intelligible and most faithful, living too in the affections of your nation, and its very words interwoven with your thoughts and speech.

But it seemed to me that something more was required for historical discussion. Here we meet on neutral ground. We must recur to the very words of the original sacred text; and there it is that I feel embarrassed even now.

As to the text of the Old Testament, I, like my brethren, used the Alexandrian version of the Jews; and I feel myself open to censure for not going back to the Hebrew original. Let me, therefore, at once confess to you that I never was a Hebrew scholar, although I knew more about the Hebrew than those around me. But I dare say the learned men who criticize and judge me are very great scholars in that language. As they are so particular in points of infinitely minor importance, and so profound in the criticism of the heathen writers, both Greeks and Latins, I feel certain they must be much more so in whatever belongs to the critical and philological understanding of the sacred text. Know, then, that I feel my weakness on this point, and that it is my firm purpose as soon as I shall have vindicated my character and authorship, and have paid a farewell visit to Rome and to Portus, to come to you and sit down in the shade of your Academies, and ask you many questions about the perplexities which I could not solve in my time, nor Irenæus in his. I feel only too deeply that we were all much in the dark about this point, but most particularly about the prophecies, which I understand your people handle with such admirable readiness, and apply with certainty even to these times. Of the Hebrew text, therefore, I say nothing but this:—happy you who are able to read and to interpret it as good critical and Hebrew scholars; for we all of us knew very little about it.

But I come now to my difficulty respecting the original text of the New Testament. How is it that you do not read the same text which we had in our time? Ours was one delivered to us from the elders, and, as we thought, from the blessed Apostles and from the Apostolic writers; and I never heard of any considerable difference among the Churches of the East and West on this point. But, as I was going the other day through my doctrinal works with one of your countrymen, he, being a learned and, what is more, a sincere man, took me to task for some of

my quotations. He said that they were not correct, and that, with reference to the text of the first verses of St. John's Gospel, I did not understand the commonest rules of punctuation.[10] This very naturally made a deep impression on my mind. "You are a wise man indeed," I said to him; "and you will help me out of a great difficulty, if you will tell me whence you got your text, of which you speak with so much confidence. I have told you what our authorities were; and it is difficult for me to understand how later changes can have improved an old text, or of what great importance it can be to know the different ways in which subsequent copyists disfigured and interpolated the texts read by the Fathers, when the old texts agree so well among themselves. So I thought: but how was I humbled (and, I confess, puzzled too) when my learned friend told me, that two booksellers, the one a Gaul, and the other a Batavian, had manufactured that text for you from avowedly late and discordant manuscripts; and that, this text having been received by the people who bought those copies, and made them and their reprints general school-books, it was thought neither reverent nor profitable to discuss that question in this country. Be this as it may, he concluded by saying, "What is printed is printed: and you, as a foreigner, must accept the text as we offer it to you."

Now my first thought was something like this: "What perplexing people these islanders are! They have undoubtedly an esoteric and reserved doctrine, as well as an exoteric and popular one, although they do not avow it. For they themselves possess a most beautiful manuscript of high antiquity, and while reading it the other day, I found exactly all my texts, as I knew them from Irenæus, and from the library belonging to our presbytery in the Jews' quarter, near the place where St. Peter suffered martyrdom. There can be no doubt those learned men know full well that this text, which is the same as the ancient Church read, is the right text. But such is their self-denial, and their respect for what they have received from the two foreign booksellers, that they conceal from the less knowing that they know better. Whatever be their reason for this mysterious reserve, I cannot but admire the self-denial of

which such reserve must be a proof and an example." So I then said to myself, and so I say now to you. Only let it be fully understood, that, when you in future reason with me upon Greek texts of Scripture, I appeal to your fairness (as I know I must not appeal to my superior knowledge), and beg of you to allow me to keep to that text which we old Christians knew in our time, and to that Scripture which we acknowledged to be canonical, that is to say, Apostolical.[11]

As to this latter point, I promise not to intrude upon you as canonical a book called the "Apocalypse of St. Peter," which our Roman Apostle and martyr had introduced to be read in our Church, on account of certain striking and graphic passages respecting the past things and future life, which certainly would do no harm. I never quoted it. You will, on your side, kindly abstain from quoting what you call the Second Epistle of St. Peter. I might have been induced to do so, in order to prove my theory about the coming of Antichrist and the end of the world after 6000 years. But I could not in good conscience. The ancient Churches did not know such a letter. I confess, having read it, I like the beginning well; but the rest seems to me an imitation of the Epistle of Jude, which we considered at Rome as canonical as you do.

This topic brings me to the first point on which I have to defend myself before you. I will summon courage to say something in defence of my allegorical interpretations, which my learned friends in this country generally find so extremely absurd. "How could the old man ever run into such fancies? I am sure he never would, if he had known the full evangelical truth!" said a very respectable clergyman the other day to a friend, in my hearing. I could not sleep the first night after this; and I begged my interpreter to read me some commentaries of his or of his friends on Daniel and the Apocalypse. For on these two books I know I have written with great ignorance: only let it not be forgotten, I have done so, as my work on Antichrist

shows, with great diffidence, and never argued against others upon those conjectures and guesses, as I will prove to you shortly. My companion chose, indeed, as he assured me, the best and most pious and learned books ever written on the subject; and he went so far as to say they were the books of the age. Certainly I found the authors themselves had no diffidence whatever in their method of interpretation; and this assuredly is something much to be admired. For they were obliged to confess to me, that all similar attempts had proved to be delusions; and I was able to show that, if there had been any truth in them, the world would have perished half a dozen times over in the last hundred years. "Mark," I said, "at all events this, the predictions based upon that method have hitherto turned out to be quite as unfounded as my much derided and exploded conjectures on the time of the coming of Antichrist. But I confess to you, with great frankness, yours are likely to have the same fate in the next twenty or thirty years, when, I understand, this world must come to an end, according to those enlightened interpreters. Which, then, is more likely to perish within that period — the world, or your system? I incline to believe the world will go on, and your interpreters, if any there be, will find no readers in this country. As regards Rome, having heard very little from that quarter since I left this world, I do not know exactly what Callistus' successors may have done there. He was a great tyrant; and his successors may have been no better than he was: but I certainly think you must be mistaken in believing that St. John's vision of the fall of Rome did not apply to imperial and heathen Rome, but to Christian and Callistian Rome. I can assure you, that they who had seen the Apostle, or learnt from those who had seen him (among whom my master was one), never dreamt of doubting that such was the meaning of his words. And I must confess, reading the book now rationally, I find the text does not allow us to apply to your own time predictions connected with events which relate to imperial Rome. You may be quite right in saying, that, if the Apostle condemned Nero and his satellites, who tortured and burned the Christians, he must also have condemned popish Rome, as you call it, if it corrupted and oppressed Christianity.

But then you must also consider, that the Apostle would not have so inveighed against it, because Christian Rome is built upon the site of the heathen city of the seven hills, but because that condemnation is written in the eternal decrees of God against whatever is unholy and corrupt, and stands in the way of the progress of His kingdom, wherever it be. That is an inference, but not an interpretation; and we were now speaking of interpretation, that is to say, of finding out what the Apostle meant to say about the times and their epochs. I myself inferred, in my commentary upon the Apocalypse, that it was quite fair to see in the condemnation of the Jezebel of the Thyatirans an equal condemnation of those conceited and lying Montanist women, who persecuted the saints of the Lord in the same church of Thyatira. But I did not deny that St. John, by that Jezebel, designated a blasphemous woman of his days, and that the details of his book respecting Thyatira applied to the Thyatira of his own time. I only thought, like himself, that one Jezebel is as bad as another. But, let me remind you, I also thought that one Daniel was as good as another. 'Whoever,' I said in my Antichrist, 'resolves not to eat of the food of the intellectual Nebuchadnezzar, and whoever afflicts his soul with fasting in this Babylon here, through the knowledge of the truth, he is Daniel; and what is told about the Daniel of old will be applicable to him. For both are of one and the same principle, and one and the same habit, so they may both be called Daniel.'" Now, do you not think I had more comfort in this contemplation than I ever could have had, if the period at which the world would come to an end had been really made known to me? Does the end of the world not come to every one of us at the hour of our death, the time of which is restricted within very narrow limits? Do you know what cured me, even in my lifetime, of my Apocalyptic dreams? I found out that some of the Montanist women had foretold repeatedly the epochs of external events which came to pass in their time.[12] Now, am I to think for that, I said to myself, that these women have the Holy Spirit in them? What has the Holy Spirit to do with counting years and months and days? In His kingdom, the only true and the only divine one, time and space are of a

very subordinate importance; and I should suppose that, wherever He has moved holy men in the Church to say something respecting times, it will be found that the subject of the prophecy is not to be wholly external and idealess, but connected with the great thoughts of God, and, finally, that it offers to the mind a certain latitude, and to the individual will and national action all their energy. But even such predictions can only be of a very secondary nature, and, I suppose, subordinate to the fact whether nation or individual concerned does or does not certain good or wicked things. On the contrary, what an inexhaustible treasure of thought and of holy inspiration is there in the idea, that whoever testifies to the truth, and against the tyrant, and despises all the comforts of the body, and offers his life for the defence of truth, is as much Daniel as the historical one! This contemplation comforted me and many other Christians at that time; and I will not conceal from you, it also prevented me from being startled the other day, when a German tried to prove to me that our book of Daniel was not written by that pious and wise patriarch of the Jews, whom Hezekiel names between Noah and Job, but by an equally pious and wise, and therefore patriotic and courageous man, who, in the midst of the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes, and of the horrors of idolatry, when every word was watched by the spies, every patriotic writing persecuted as a crime, chose this form in order to instil holy courage and undying faith into the hearts of his suffering and almost despairing countrymen. "Well," I said, "I cannot enter now into this discussion: I must first learn Hebrew, and Hebrew criticism, and the later vernacular idiom of Palestine, which they call Chaldee; and all that I intend to do at one of your or the English universities as soon as I have leisure. But I do not mind at all, if you prove to me that the thing is so. For truth has after all in itself a paramount value; and if you do not deny that the book is the same as that which our Saviour read, and if you admit also that this intellectual Daniel was a pious and truthful man, uttering the truth which was in him by the same spirit which spoke through the holy men before him, that he acted out of self-sacrificing love to God and his brethren, and if you acknowledge as prophetic what he says

of the final victory of justice and holiness, I do not see why we should be losers, and not infinitely gainers in every respect."

I find that I am interrupted in my defence by some expressions of indignation or surprise. As far as the tumult allows me to understand what is meant, I believe I may refer it to questions like these: "Will you invent and then justify pious fraud? Should we not give up altogether the character of the Bible as a sacred and inspired book, if we admitted such a hypothesis?"

Now, my friends, do not forget that I have declared my readiness to submit my case to your judgment also in this point, as soon as we shall have studied the matter together. But, at present, let me only ask; Would it be fair to exclude entirely the free discussion of whether the late origin of Daniel is a hypothesis or a fact? Certainly it would not. But still ask your own conscience whether you do not in fact exclude a fair discussion, if you set down beforehand as a starting point, that it cannot be a fact, because you suppose that it would pre-judge the sacred character of the book and dishonour the Bible. I cannot see the difference between such a proceeding and that of the Roman inquisitors against Galileo, which you always quote against Rome. They maintained that the honour of Scripture depended upon assuming as certain that the philosopher's system must be false: for, they asserted, as the Scripture evidently supposes the sun to move and the earth to stand still, it would be impiety to admit that such a hypothesis could be a fact. You ought at least to go as far as the Jesuits did in the seventeenth century, when they edited your Newton's "Principia" as a model of ingenuity for rendering plausible a hypothesis which a good Christian, of course, knew beforehand to be wrong. Now it is easy to see that whoever starts from the assumption, that to admit such a hypothesis is impiety, will never find the truth. For there is no historical truth and no philological fact, against which theological obstinacy cannot raise many objections.

Many of your people think themselves justified in asserting against an alleged historical fact its improbability; without considering that nothing is true or untrue in the eyes of history, because it is probable or improbable, but simply because, assuming its general logical possibility, it can be proved to be or not to be a fact. This is a sad subterfuge of Jesuitism or of ignorance. As long as there shall be critical and honest inquiry of truth-seeking minds, and courage to believe in truth, historical facts seem to me as much capable of demonstration as mathematical truths. Of course, in both cases, such a demonstration supposes a certain knowledge and a certain critical faculty. But as we cannot enter now into such a demonstration, let me for a moment beseech you to ask yourselves the question: What reason have you to suppose that, if the book is found to have been written under Antiochus, it was ever meant by the author as an imposition, and not as a poetical form, imperiously prescribed by the dreadful circumstances of the time, and rightly understood by the faithful for whom it was written out of the purest motives. You must be aware, that your supposition is quite a gratuitous one. On the contrary, if you look to the state of things, and if you consider the place which the book of Daniel occupies in the Hebrew canon, at the very end of which it is placed, separated from all the old prophetic works, you cannot be surprised that I declare myself not at all to be startled by that hypothesis, which appears to me even now all but proved in spite of my feeble knowledge of the Hebrew and of the Chaldee. On the contrary, I feel now much more strongly the truly sacred and prophetic character of the book, when I take all the account of the histories of the Ptolemies and the Seleucides before Antiochus Epiphanes to be a historical introduction under the form of a vision, as the character assumed demanded it. I then am struck more than ever by the strength of faith in the pious mind of the author, to behold the light of salvation, when the clouds were blacker than ever, and when nothing but extermination or apostasy seemed to remain to God's chosen people. As I find this belief in the political salvation of his people the more sublime and holy, because it is in his mind identified with his faith in God's eternal kingdom of truth and

justice on earth, this fact gives me strength to believe that the prophecy respecting the end of human destinies will at last prove substantially true. So much now of Daniel.

Considering all this, I confess I feel only the more strongly the imperfection and the presumption of what I wrote in my book about Antichrist. But allow me to repeat to you, my Christian friends, what I said to the English divines, when justifying myself before them. In judging me respecting this point, you ought not to forget the times in which I lived. I did not write for my amusement. When I composed my book about Antichrist, containing comments on Daniel and the Apocalypse, in the reign of the emperor Severus, the people had not yet recovered from the panic, caused some years before, by the ridiculous calculations of Judas, the unenlightened Christian writer, who had endeavoured to prove, that, according to St. John, Antichrist must come, and the world must perish, in the tenth year of that emperor, by which, I suppose, he meant to designate the end of the second century after the birth of Christ. I was opposed to that interpretation, although I felt all the weight of those terrible times, as my words sufficiently prove. You may read them in that book, where, explaining the seventh chapter of Daniel, and speaking of the fourth monarchy (which I took to be that of the Romans, and the last), I say: "Already the iron reigns: already it tames and crushes everything: already it subdues all who are unwilling: already we see these things." That same feeling of a great catastrophe about to happen in the known world was so much in the hearts of all our people, that I could not avoid expressing an opinion about it. But see what I said when entering upon this subject: "We are obliged to say that which we ought not to say, because we are forced to do so." And then I hesitatingly bring forward a guess, which is based upon a conjecture adopted and taught by my venerable master, Irenæus, that the world's having been created in six days seems to imply that it would

last six thousand years, "one day being with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Now, as I had in my "Chronicle" adopted the scheme which seemed to me the most probable, that our Lord was born in the 5500th year of the world, I ventured to say that it would not improbably come to an end after five hundred years more, therefore about three hundred years beyond the time in which I wrote.

It certainly seemed impossible to us that the Roman empire, and therefore the world, should last much longer. Broken and shaken as it was, that empire became more and more divided between rival commanders of legions. There was no nation or national life left within, and none without, as far as we short-sighted mortals could see. But, moreover, in the eyes of a Christian, there was such a depravity and rottenness in the state, so demoralizing a system of government, such contempt for laws human and divine, so unblushing a purpose to govern by force and terror only, under the simulacrum of republican forms. It was a military government, with a double army; an army of police to watch and denounce, and one of prætorians to crush every aspiration after lawful liberty, and to punish even the appearance of resistance or dissatisfaction. The spies, called *delatores*, under cover of the law, entered into all the private relations of life and preyed upon the people. The Christians, who were almost incessantly vexed and persecuted and tortured and slaughtered for defending the only liberty of mankind not yet extinguished, that of not worshipping idols, could least of all believe that God would tolerate such a state of things much longer, and not perform an act of divine justice, which to the elect would be one of mercy. Do you think, that because they made no revolution they did not execrate tyranny, and did not pray for the speedy end of it? We never ceased to be Romans and Greeks, and we never praised arbitrary rule as a divine institution. If we had done so, we should have been unworthy to be the disciples of Christ. Our belief in the approaching end of the world was an error: so it was with the blessed Apostles themselves, at least during a great part of their lives. But, in looking back, I think there was some truth in that foreboding, the result both of despair and of faith, both of moral indignation

and of divine love. A world was indeed at that time crumbling to pieces, and Christianity was, in the hands of Providence, a powerful element of its dissolution. For let nobody overlook this truth, the elements of life become elements of death to those who reject them. We were right in our forebodings of the imminent fall of the world which we saw. We were heard when, in the hours of persecution and of prayer, we exclaimed, "O Lord, how long!" The world which we knew did terminate: what we were ignorant of was, that a new world was already beginning, while we thought all lost on this earth.

When, therefore, I now hear of such forebodings, I do not at all scorn and deride them. There must be some feeling of decay, some looking for a necessary change, which makes people listen, not only to wild dreams, and to old and new prophecies, but even to such dull books as those which they have made me read. But that they, as Christians, should believe that the world is to come to an end, because, perchance, they are at an end with their theological systems and wisdom, that seems very strange to me. It certainly is much more absurd than that we should have come to a similar conclusion, when we were at the end, not only of our wisdom, but also of our hopes. What am I to think of their Christian faith? Do they not believe (and even preach) that Christianity must cover the face of the earth, even as the waters cover the great deep? And do they not see that very gradually, but still unmistakeably, it has begun to penetrate the civil and social relations of life, after having for many centuries merely varnished over the surface of a barbarous society? And do they not see by the side of the elements of destruction (more effects than causes in themselves) many elements of life? Are there not nations? is there not national life? Is there not a general yearning for Christ's religion, for the simple truth of the Gospel? At all events, if on this point Irenæus and I were so hasty and such fools as many of you may think, your people seem scarcely to show the great wisdom I expected to find in you.

Now when I did not conceal this my opinion from my kind interpreter, a colleague of his, a man of plain speech, and very undoubting and authoritative, observed, I had not fallen upon

the right books: he gave me others, and "Look here," he exclaimed, "and then say whether you can see the progress we have made, if you compare with these good and sober books all those queer and useless things you have written about the Creation, in explaining, or rather obscuring, the first chapters of Genesis, which are so clear to us, and in short, if you look back to all your useless speculations which are prying irreverently into the secrets of God's nature. For, my Christian friend," he added, in a most solemn tone, "do not take it ill, but I have very serious doubts whether you are after all correct in your doctrine, and really orthodox."

You see, we thus came from the exegetical question to the chapter of theological orthodoxy. I soon found that my new friend tested this orthodoxy principally by certain metaphysical formularies. He did not accuse me flatly of heterodoxy, but he condemned me for having raised philosophical questions on revealed things, which, he said, were to be believed without being inquired into, whenever they were unintelligible. "Look," my new friend said, "how shortly we treat all these mysteries, how reverently we abstain from prying curiously into them! Enough has been said of them in the creeds and in the formularies of the later councils, who have so well settled all these matters for us and for the whole Christian world, that we do not think about them any more. Alas for you, that it was done after your time? This is an excuse as far as it goes, although I am startled to hear that you were on this score so much more ignorant, and so much less clear and precise, than I supposed you to have been. At all events, I am sure you will now accept these formularies thankfully, subscribe to them unconditionally, and in future hold your peace; or if you must go on putting questions, express yourself more correctly and guardedly, and be satisfied with our short and reserved answers."

"My good friend," I answered him, "does it not strike you that such language must be, if not humbling, at least startling to me, who am called one of the Fathers, and who was thought

the first author of my time in the Roman, if not in the whole of the Western, Church. I must begin to learn; and I will carefully read those books of yours, to which you refer, both of interpretation and of doctrine: they must be quite wonderful, to have inspired you with such a confidence in the wisdom of your party."

When I had read them, my old idea returned. These learned people, I said, have certainly, however they deny it, a private and esoteric, as well as a popular and exoteric, doctrine and system of interpretation. For those formularies are full of what appear to me fragments and remains of the speculations of our time. I perceive very plainly that there can have been no more Gnosticism and Gnostic acuteness to combat when they were framed, but rather questions which the Divines of the Church themselves raised upon conceits of their own, and decided all their own way. Still, however that be, what connection is there between these metaphysical formularies and your own books? There is no harm in those books: we used to tell something like their contents to our children before they were of full age; but as to explaining those formularies, or leading to an insight into the great questions which arise in the mind intent upon divine things, and the relation of the immortal soul to God and to the universe, they do not even attempt it. So that here is a great puzzle for me. If indeed there is not this secret learning and interpretation which they conceal from me, I am driven to a startling dilemma. Either they believe in those formularies, and in the passages of the Bible to which they refer; and then the thinking men do not believe in that (to speak plainly) materialistic and sensual view of those homely books, in which the Creation is treated as a process of manufacture, and the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as three historical personages. Or these people really express what they understand of Christianity in those dry, empty, and shallow doctrinal works; and then they do not really believe in the formularies of the ancient Church, but maintain them only out of superstition, and from a political respect for what is established. But what becomes then of their evangelical faith in the Scriptures? St. John's prologue, and Christ himself in the

most important speeches reported of him in that Gospel, speak a metaphysical language; so do St. Paul's Epistles: and, besides, the whole Christian faith stands upon this, that there is a moral and holy government of the world. What is there of either in these books, if you compare them even with what the heathens, whether poets or philosophers, have said of things divine and human? Now, I said to myself, this is a most serious dilemma, and I must satisfy my mind at least to a certain point on this all-important subject. As for myself, since they are becoming aggressive, I shall never be able to defend myself successfully, unless I occasionally take the offensive. And as for them, they will never derive any advantage from these disputations, unless some thought be stirred up in their minds, which will be done more easily when they perceive how they would appear to us if we were to have judged them at Rome or Alexandria.

With these ideas in my mind, I agreed to have a conference with my new friends, and having met them accordingly, I said: "You have conferred a double benefit upon me; for, having promised me one set of books, as expressing your religious system, you have given me, most distinctly, two. What embarrasses me is this, that these two appear to me to be very loosely, if at all, connected with each other: I mean the ancient creeds, and your own meditations on Christianity. You must therefore extend your kindness still farther, and help your guest, that he may know in what way you unite the two in your minds; for I am sure you must feel the want of bringing into harmony elements which appear so very heterogeneous. Otherwise, I am afraid, this entire want of connection between two things, both of which you receive as expositions of your faith, must end either in distracting you, or in making you give up the one or the other, if not Christianity altogether. Now, as to your creeds, the one on which I understand the bishops agreed at Nicæa, about a hundred years after I left this world, comes in many points very near my own mind, only that it seems to say either too much or too little on philosophical points. Above all, it appears to me strange that the World should have so merged in the Son, that it has entirely dis-

appeared. This I must consider rather a departure from Scripture; and I cannot help thinking that it has led to an unphilosophical identification, not in substance, but in form, of the divinity and humanity of Christ, or the Logos and the historical Christ. The speculative Christian mind will always have a great reluctance to identify one with the other so entirely without distinction, as to merge the eternal idea entirely in its temporal manifestation. We found that in our disputes with the Gnostics. But as to the formulary named after Athanasius, he who made it, and those who adopted it as an expression of the consciousness of the Church, must have entirely lost sight of the principal object and the very starting point and origin of our speculations. It treats one subordinate question alone, and this not only more peremptorily than Scripture authorizes us to do, but also less philosophically. Above all, what state must the human mind have been in, either to demand or to yield implicit adhesion to such formal subtleties under pain of damnation! I do not wonder now that the false prophet and his followers destroyed Christianity in half the world; and I am comforted about that incredible saying of a learned bishop of New Rome, styling himself a patriarch, who, as my German friend has told me, having read a theological book of mine which the copyists had attributed to Josephus, wondered how the Jew could speak about Christ 'almost as if he were a Christian.' There must be, I think, something very wrong in those formularies, if the primitive consciousness of the Church respecting God, the Word, and the Son, became so entirely obscured to those who had only just completed a system of divinity out of those formularies.

"All this, my friends," I continued, "I say in self-defence; it is the impression which those old formularies make upon me when I am summoned to correct what I have said of Christ, and what the whole Church said in my time. I feel there is something in those creeds which connects itself with my own thoughts, but also something which I cannot connect well with what we had been taught, and what we ourselves taught, sixteen or seventeen hundred years ago. Such, then, is my difficulty with the old formularies. But as to your modern

books, what is there in them of the Infinite or the Absolute, of the first principal Cause of the Universe, with the confession of which all those formularies begin? Not one syllable. What is there in them of the Self-consciousness of God, the eternal Word, being God Himself, by whom all things were created, in whom all created things have their life, and mankind their light, that is to say, the understanding of things divine? Absolutely nothing. And as to the modern philosophers to whom you refer, those who pretend to preach what pure reason teaches, they seem to me to be downright materialists."

Here they stopped me, and said: "Stop, stranger, you Germanize. Where is any thing of this modern philosophical mysticism either in Scripture or in the formularies you speak of? Let us reason and speculate upon purely scriptural and catholic ground, on the words of the Bible, and of the creeds."

"Well," I said, "you agree, then, to enter into a philosophical discussion upon this basis?" "We do," they exclaimed.—"And you will allow me now, in my turn, to ask you questions, starting from some point which we both think self-evident, and therefore a safe beginning?" "We will," they replied.—"I rejoice in this, and have only to ask one single preliminary question, which may appear very strange to some of you. Are you convinced that you exist, and that you know you exist?" "What do you mean?" they exclaimed. —"Do you believe that you yourselves are a reality?" "If not," one replied, "what should we believe in at all?"—"I am exceedingly obliged to you," I said, "for granting me so much. Well, then, you will have no difficulty in believing that you are thinking and reasoning beings, not by accident, but necessarily, because it is only by believing reason to be a reality, that you are conscious of existing yourselves." "We do not doubt such a reality," they exclaimed.—"Well, I rejoice at that exceedingly," I replied, "for if you really do so, you will feel yourselves obliged to follow whither our common reasoning will lead us of necessity, unless we disbelieve ourselves. And, besides, I think that, knowing reason cannot be in contradiction with itself, you will do so willingly, and thus relieve me of much pain and trouble. I then start from this your faith in

reasoning; for, as to the creeds, I know already that you believe in them.

"You, therefore, in the first place, confess the Father to be the Creator of all things, visible and invisible?" "We do."—"What is visible is the material world?" "So it is."—"The invisible things, therefore, do they not mean the immaterial?" "How should they not?"—"Now what is immaterial may be infinite or may be finite, as you say our soul is, as having been created." "It may."—"But God cannot be finite, and must therefore be infinite." "Who doubts that?"—"Is not that which is infinite called so because it has no limits in its being?" "It is."—"Which of the two, then, is the positive, and which the negative? I mean, which of the two asserts something affirmative,—that which is without bounds, or that which has certain bounds and limits?" "We do not know."—"Well," I replied, "I think you do, my Christian friends. I see your difficulty. If you look to the formation of the word, the Infinite seems to be the negation of the Finite. So is the being immortal the negation of being mortal. But would you be affirming something, if you were satisfied with asserting that to be immortal is nothing but the negation of being subject to death? Must there not be some positive substance of reality, which exempts God's existence from being limited as to time?" "It is so, undoubtedly."—"Well, but then you can scarcely mean to deny that Indivisible and Infinite are expressions implying something in the highest degree positive. Now, if we take away all limitations of Substance and Being, may that which remains not be called the Absolute?" "It may."—"Now, if God is the Absolute, and the spirit of man is the Relative or Limited, of two things one must be true. Either the Absolute and the Relative are different from each other in kind, and then, of course, there can be no inward and substantial, but only an outward and accidental, connection between them. Or they are different only in degree, by the accident of existence by which the Finite is affected; or, in other terms, only as far as the one is without limitation, and therefore not bound to time or space, and does not exist in them nor according to the laws of either, as you allow that our spirit and reasoning do?"

"Certainly, one or the other," they answered; "but we do not see what could decide us to affirm the one or the other."

"Indeed!" was my reply; "but you do believe the second article of the Nicene Creed?" "We should not think ourselves Christians if we did not."—"Well, then, let us look at the first words of that article. Much as I regret that the language of St. John's prologue is rather obscured or slighted in the expressions of the Nicene Creed, and entirely neglected in what is called the Athanasian, this much is certain, the Son is here declared to be equal to the Father, because he is taken to be the embodiment of the eternal Word. At all events, you will allow me to use this term instead. Now, is the Word a manifestation of God or not?" "Of course it is."—"But the Word is itself originally God?" "So the text clearly says."—"What originally exists in the Absolute must substantially, and therefore eternally, be the same. Must it not?" "We do not see how we can gainsay this."—"Now, if the Word be both the manifestation of God's own substance and the adequate expression of his Reason, and, at the same time, be called the Life of created things and the Light of mankind, both created nature and created mind must have a divine substance and life in them, only with this difference, that the mind alone is conscious of it, and therefore has the knowledge of it. Indeed, this saying of the Evangelist seems to me to be borne out by the fact that Gravity and Light, and other phenomena of matter, are manifestations of the life which is in matter, and the laws of these phenomena can be found out by the strength of Reason which is in the mind. These are the very laws which your old and new natural philosophers have so marvellously investigated and explained by mathematical calculation, which is the lowest degree of philosophy, but a very important one. This proves that Nature and Mind partake of the same divine substance, Reason being consciousness of existence, and the Word being God's own consciousness of Himself, manifesting itself in the mind as Light, which is Reason. At all events, the expression of St. John clearly indicates that the same Word is, in created things, both Existence and Consciousness, and we may therefore, as Christians, safely adopt the saying, that Mind is conscious

nature, and Nature unconscious mind. Indeed, I do not see how we can interpret the prologue otherwise. Now, if the mind partakes of the divine substance, how can you dēny that the understanding of things divine is in us, and that this is the real knowledge of ourselves? It appears to me, that we cannot help agreeing; only we must take care not to lose sight of the difference between the Finite and the Infinite."

To this they replied, they did not see how to deny this consequence; but the terms I used did not convey to them a clear philosophical idea; and they therefore asked me whether I would not use another term for marking this difference between God and man. "Let us see," I replied; "perhaps Plato will help us in this, together with St. John's genuine, that is to say, well divided text. Should you understand me better, if we turn the phrase thus? Every thing that exists really and absolutely, not being subject to any limits, cannot be subject either to time or to space, or to any division or change of existence." "Doubtless."—"Is not time divided into past, present, and future?" "Every body knows that."—"Now it is generally allowed that there is a change implied in this, so that what is past is not, but has been; what is future is not, but will be; and what is present is such that it neither has been exactly as it is now, nor will be so in future; otherwise there would be no division. But at all events there is a division in time; and the Infinite cannot be affected by a division: therefore God is rightly called He who is above time or timeless. And you will certainly also allow that there is change in the things which have a finite existence, and that change cannot exist in absolute Being?" "How should it?"—"Now, if there cannot be change, there cannot be development either, which is the change of one and the same thing from one state of existence into another; of which, change in time and in space is the form. Is it so?" "We affirm it."—"And at the same time you see that here lies the difficulty. For the Infinite cannot be subject to change, and still we acknowledge it to be the cause of that changeable existence which we know to be a reality. Here then seems to be a contradiction, and it seems the most natural method to start from the difference between what exists unchangeably, and what is

in a continual transition from one state to another. Shall we then call this transition of existence from one state into another, that which is evolving, the Evolving? endeavouring thus to express the *Genesis* of the Greek, the *Fieri* of the Latins, or the *Werden* of the Germans, in opposition to the *Esse* or the *Sein*. Very well; shall we then say that the Infinite is the Being, and the Finite the Evolving?" "We cannot think of a better term, so let us adopt that English word."—"Well," I continued, "if we allow this, our former argument seems to oblige us also to say, that as the Infinite is different from the Finite only in that the one has limitations, the other not, the Evolving (or the limited existence of mind in time) does not differ from God's Being but in this, that the one is an ideal, the other a real existence. We must now see what we understand by an ideal and a real existence. I presume, then, that we take real in the sense that it means what exists in time and space, and ideal in the sense that it signifies the creative thought of the same, that which in all these changes constitutes the unity of the evolving existence. This thought is an existence, yea, the only true existence in the highest sense, because it not only does not change, but we have declared it to be the cause of all changeable existence. We may therefore say that the Thought, identified with Will, and animated by Love, is that which must be called the Being, that which *is*, in the eminent sense, and that this Being is eternal, and not subject to time, therefore not subject to the change from past into present, and from present into future."

"I see," said one of them, an elderly man, "what you are driving at: but what becomes of the difference between Jesus and the believer, between Christ and the Christian?"—"Why, if I answer that the difference is that between the Infinite, not deteriorated in substance by the connection with the Finite, but substantially expressed by it within the limits of the evolving existence and therefore also of time and space, on the one hand, and of the Infinite inadequately expressed (as all believers find in themselves it is) on the other, I think I follow closely the argument which has led us safely to our former conclusions. And, in doing so, I find also we arrive exactly at a view of the

matter, without which you, I will not say cannot accept, but cannot even understand, one word of our creeds, any more than of our prologue."

"Well," exclaimed my elderly friend, "do you not see that there is great danger in such a juxta-position?"

"Instead of answering you directly," I replied, "let me ask in my turn: Do you think there can be any real danger in truth, as truth?" "No, certainly not," he answered; "I cannot allow that."

"Well, indeed, I do not think you can, without denying our second and our first articles, Christ and God himself. For you know that you are flying in the face of the most positive and solemn expressions and assurances of Christ himself. I do not see how, if you are not really children of God, you can believe him to be the child of God.

"If the danger then is in the abuse of something good, as of truth and godliness, and if the measure of that danger is in the measure of the importance of the object abused, will there not be found the greatest danger in the greatest good, and, therefore, in the greatest truth?" "So it would appear."—"But that danger is not in truth itself, but in the misunderstanding of it?" "It must be in the misunderstanding."—"Might we not therefore say, there is no greater danger than in the misunderstanding of the truths taught by Scripture and Reason respecting the highest, that is to say, the divine things?" "We might."—"But is not the final consequence we have to draw herefrom this, that we ought to take the greatest care to understand well the truth?" "Assuredly."—"And who, think you, will understand it best, he who does not think about it, or he who makes it the object of his earnest thought? It appears to me impossible it should not be the latter; as ignorance of a thing which is allowed to be good, is worse than all misunderstandings of the same.

They kept silence. But I felt moved in the spirit, and said: "Having then come so far, let us go straight to the third article; for I am afraid it is your ignoring that article which makes you still doubtful about the rest. Do you really believe in what the formularies say in it?"

"We think we do," they answered, "because we are sure it is scriptural."—"Well, then, you believe in what St. Paul says of the Spirit, that it 'searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God'?" "How should we not? But is that not the Spirit which we confess to be God?"—"Undoubtedly the Holy Spirit must be in the Being, if it is in the Evolution; but then we may also turn it and say: How should it not be, finitely and relatively, in the Evolution, if it is, infinitely and absolutely, in the Being?" "But may we indeed turn it so without irreverence?" asked my elderly friend.—"Look to it yourself," I replied. "Can you otherwise explain those words of the Apostle? Can the Spirit, as far as he is the Infinite Being Himself, search the deep things, that is, the hidden nature or substance of God?" "It would appear not."—"Well, then, the Apostle must have understood it as referring to that divine Spirit which is in the mind of believers." "But then I ask," he replied, "where is the standard of truth, considering the great divergence of opinions and assertions respecting truth?"

And here I could not help smiling, and I said: "Well, do you not see now that I was not quite wrong when I expressed my doubts respecting your belief in the third article? For that which follows, that you believe in the Universal Church, seems to me to give the answer required." "How does it?" asked my friend, with somewhat of astonishment.

"I have spoken of the Holy Spirit as being in the believers, not in the believer. Now let us inquire of that argument which has brought us so far; perhaps it will yield us the answer we seek. The Spirit and the Church are put together, here and in all evangelical and Apostolic writings. The Spirit is in the Church, and the Church is all the believers. If you have a doubt upon this point, I am ready to discuss it with you thoroughly, even if you will force me to descend to discussions like that of Apostolic succession. For we are here arrived at the very cause of much confusion and of much trouble, present and to come." "No," exclaimed a younger friend, "that would be what you would have called in your language an 'aprosdionyson,' or something uncongenial with thoughts of things divine and intellectual. I certainly should like you to tell us

afterwards something about the sacraments and baptismal regeneration. But at present let us keep to the main argument, and I may assert that we who are here present agree to the proposition."—"Generalizing, then, this proposition," I continued, "will not the relation of the Spirit to the Church, as to the believing universality of mankind, be analogous to the relation which the Word, and its embodiment in Jesus, bears to the believing individual?—so that there would be, respecting man, two co-eternal manifestations of the Infinite, the individual and the collective. Certainly, as we have taken ourselves to be a reality, God cannot have thought man except in a double capacity, as an individual and as a whole. For the realization of the Infinite by the finite human mind, moving in time, is necessarily a double one; that by the individual mind, and that by the whole human race. It is self-evident that one cannot think of mankind without thinking of man: but see whether we can think of man without thinking of him also as an integral part of many? God did not create man, but men, man and woman.

"In order to understand the proposition now under discussion, you may begin with what is the most self-evident necessity of the human existence, the domestic relations, and proceeding thence, you necessarily will arrive at the great society of mankind, divided into families, tribes, and nations, and exhibiting itself in the succession of generations, through ages and ages. The Evolution here, is it not the same as in the individual, only on a larger scale? Is it not a continued change, and undoubtedly the most complete development of the idea of humanity?"

"It is."

"Such an evolution may last hundreds and thousands of years; it always will remain finite, as that which is evolving within the limits of time and space, and never will become that which really and truly *is*, the Being, because the Being allows of nothing divided, and, therefore, not of time and change. Eternity is not accumulation, but extinction, of time. Therefore, nobody can say that our argument makes mankind God, any more than that it makes man God. Still less can any one say that it gives God no ante-mundane or extra-mundane exist-

ence. On the contrary, our argument shows the logical absurdity of letting the Being grow out of the Evolution; which last is a division of existence, and, therefore, presupposes the totality of existence, or the absolute Being (uniting absolute Will with absolute Reason and the complete consciousness of their Unity), fully as much as the effect presupposes the cause, or the material object expressive of thought and reason presupposes that immaterial thought and reason."

"But," asked my inquisitive young friend, "if we agree to this, must we then not consider the Spirit a Person, as much as the Son? And you seem to have had a great reluctance in allowing this."

"This is a difficult question," I replied; "but I thank you for adverting to this point. I think I can satisfy you by two positions. First, I called the Word as much a Person as the Father. The Son is conscious Reason united with Will, as the Father is conscious Will united with Reason. For a Person not affected by Finiteness can mean nothing but a conscious Being, uniting both Will and Reason. The Subject in the infinite Being implies no more limitation than its adequate Object: both are infinite. In the second place, I agree with you, of course, that whatever is in the Evolution must be in the Being, except the Finiteness, and what belongs to Finiteness: for that is the Creation, flowing out of divine Love. I therefore think, the line of argument which we have hitherto followed would oblige us to say something like the following. The element of the Spirit, as the general feeling by which different individuals are united in thought and in action, manifests itself practically more or less in every society, as distinct from the sum of positive and negative elements of individuals which compose it, when referred to the common object which unites them. And still, whichever of those component members is moved by the general Spirit to identify himself with the object of the association, and with whatever of reasonable and good is manifested by its other members, finds this general Spirit of the association overpowering, but not destroying, his own individuality, on the contrary purifying and strengthening it. Now this could not be the case so generally, unless there were in the nature of

the mind, and therefore also of the infinite Mind, an element of the eternal substance which manifests itself exclusively in the collective humanity, and not in the individual as individual. He who should gainsay this, would be obliged to maintain that the difference implied is identical with the difference between Finite and Infinite, which is absurd, for both belong to the Finite. The unity of language, of society, of church, of mankind, is therefore a reality, as well as the individual person is one, and inherent in the idea of man. This too must be the reason why people united in one way or another can feel, and speak, and act together as they do; and this will be the real explanation of the fact which we are daily witnessing, that people are seized by the Spirit, as by an invisible current of a higher, all-pervading element. I think you will also agree with me, if I add that this is the only explanation worthy of thinking men, of the very origin both of speech and of religion among mankind. What therefore is called, with more or less truth, the common or public spirit, has its origin in God's eternal substance, and not in that which unthinking theologians have called the divine economy of the world, as having its root only in the Finite or in the Evolution. But, on the other hand, you will allow that there is a difference. The existence of this unity is and remains an ideal one in the Evolution, for it never appears embodied in the individual. It was not even so in the Apostles. The Spirit was in them, but never in one alone; and it was fully poured out upon a congregation of one hundred and twenty individuals, who were seized by it, the Apostles being an element only, although the most prominent part, of that society. We might perhaps say that the Spirit is both the ideality of the real existence of the human mind, and the highest finite reality of God's own thought of mankind, that is to say, of the totality of the human development. Or, so it be clearer to you, we may express the same idea thus. As the Word, having become the Son in the Evolution, is the adequate expression of God's consciousness of Himself as of the One Being, and of man as individual; so the Spirit, become finite, is God's complete consciousness of Himself, both as Will and as Reason, both as Infinite (in Himself) and as Finite (in the Evolution), and

finally as cause both of individual and of collective mind. I have no objection, if you will call this link between the One and the Many, in the Infinite as well as in the Finite, Love; for how could manifoldness be One, but by Love?"

"I think this is clearer to me," replied my young friend, who seemed to me much relieved by what had been said.

"Well," I continued, "it appears you are inclined to absolve me now from any heresy against the Spirit. But I am afraid I must now in my turn express a great anxiety for yourselves."

And here a great excitement became visible among my learned friends. For no sooner had I pronounced a few words than almost all of them began to cry out against my temerity. And indeed, even now, some kind friends near me make me signs to pass over that part of our conversation, giving me clearly enough to understand that they are afraid you will not hear me patiently, or at all events will not become or remain impressed in my favour, if I relate to you all I said. But as the Spirit moved me to speak then, so does it now; and knowing that I have your interest at heart, not my own, except as far as truth is concerned, I will withhold nothing from you, firmly relying upon your fairness and the Christian spirit within you.

What I said was something like the following: —

"My dear and learned Christian friends, I cannot quite get over my apprehension that you are heretical in your ideas respecting *Inspiration*. We thought, in our time, the holy men were inspired; you seem to think the sacred books are inspired. This is a heresy, and one which I had often to combat when arguing with the Jews. Still in them I could understand it: for they having no word for Person, and consequently none for personal existence, could never, in their metaphysical speculations, rise above the abstract notion. But what pains me infinitely more is, to find such antichristian tendencies among you."

"Surely, you do not mean to say seriously," exclaimed my friend, smiling, "that there is so enormous a difference between the two formulas? Will an inspired man not write an inspired book?"

"No, my friend," I felt obliged to reply, "unless you have the lowest of all ideas of what we used to call Inspiration at Lugdunum and at Rome, as well as in Alexandria. Inspiration works on the Spirit, therefore on Reason; for Spirit is Truth, and Truth is Reason. Certainly, a mind so inspired, that is to say, divested of Self, and driven to speak out what is Reality in him, of which Self is the negation, will speak and write as an inspired reasonable being, not as an unconscious organ, like a clairvoyant. Otherwise he would not be elevated to the divine region of thought, but lowered to the region of unconscious matter or nature. Not that I believe that the prophetical writings, from the most ancient parts of the Old Testament to the Apocalypse, can be reasonably explained without admitting the reality of vision and divination, as entirely distinct from reflective consideration and argumentation. I designate by those words an intuitive insight into the world of the spirit: and I believe that we see a shadow of that intuition upon the domain of unconscious nature in the state of such possessed persons as the Montanist women were. As this is intuition of things and events external, so the other is an immediate insight into things and events internal, connected with the development of the Divine Spirit in humanity. It therefore necessarily centres in that great incorporation of mankind, by which all faithful and pious men are members of a community of Truth, Justice, and Virtue, of which God is the eternal cause and realizer. The existence of such a power of spiritual vision is as much a fact as that of the other, if we interpret faithfully and rationally the prophetical books. But then the prophetic vision requires as much a medium of communication with the outer world as does Demonism, or whatever you will call the state of natural vision. Words are wanted, and words are expressions of the reflecting mind. Now, this mixed state between vision and reflection, which we might call the hypophetic (in contra-distinction to the prophetic), is subject to the natural finiteness

and limitation of the individual, as of a rational and self-responsible being. Man in that state will speak in intelligible words, not in those convulsive sounds breaking forth from the lips of a man who is overpowered by the sudden pressure of the Infinite; a phenomenon this latter as old as mankind, but by which I find people among you (and some very shrewd people) are strangely deluded in these days. Man in that state, I say, will speak in his own language, and, as to all things not directly expressing the vision, within the sphere of knowledge and information in which he as an individual, and his nation and age, are moving. That state must therefore necessarily be affected with all the limitations and imperfections of finiteness, and this in the same measure as the communication enters more or less into the real world. The divine nature of the vision does not consist in a magical disappearance of these divinely constituted unchangeable limits of humanity, but simply in this: that the essence of divine truth is not injured by those imperfections; that what is said by such inspired persons respecting their visions is true in the Spirit, in which alone there is truth. All interpretations of the prophets of the Old Testament and of the Apocalypse, which do not take this factor, that of vision, into account, must be imperfect and even philologically untenable, however elevated and sublime they may be. For these prophecies are not reducible to reflected wisdom, and even the most sublime ethical view, applied to them, will be found insufficient.

"But on the other hand the finite element, the element of pious and enlightened consideration of the things and events of this world by the reflective faculty of the mind in its normal state of finite consciousness of cause and effect, must be also fully acknowledged and done justice to in those prophetical writings. This part is not less inspired than the other, but differently inspired, and that it constitutes the immensely prevailing element of those writings is not derogatory to their prophetic character, but their most sublime and divine privilege. Here the substratum is the historical world in its whole reality. Persons, nations, and events of the real world, generally of the very age and time of the writer, are brought forward and

judged, but as members and instruments, or as adversaries and impediments, of the great kingdom of God upon earth, and therefore in what I have called their intellectual or ideal capacity. As to all such parts, the more the prophetical writings can be explained historically, as originally and directly applying to historical persons and facts of the writer's past or present, the greater will be the progress in understanding, not only the prophetic writings, but also the very nature of inspiration: for the real world, the ordinary history of the Jewish people, will be the more elevated to the expression of those eternal ideas, to realize which is the highest destiny and everlasting value of all history.

"You will now not misunderstand me, if I say that the inspired man will speak or write according to his human capacities, and not according to those of another individual; in his own language, and not in a tongue he has never learned; on a subject he lives in, not on things unintelligible and foreign to him. You will not take it ill, if I say that the contrary view is a degrading one, and that, in truth, unbelief lurks at the bottom of it. For, as soon as you allow any such degradation of the working of the Spirit, you deny that Spirit is Reason, and consequently that Inspiration is Truth. Now, as to real inspiration, it cannot be considered separately from its subject. As, therefore, the measure of the inspiration must not only be in proportion to the truth in the man, but also commensurate with the greatness of the object, we call inspired writers properly those who have delivered to us the mysteries of God. There are necessarily also among them differences of degree, and the highest degree will have to be reserved to what is delivered to us of Christ's words and life, and, above all, of what he said of himself, and of his relation to the Father and to mankind. The first place of all, consequently, will belong to what we read on this central subject of Christian faith in St. John's Gospel. Most of the rest in the Apostolical writings is occasional, in part even relating to transitory and external circumstances. Still in all there is one and the same Spirit, and that forms the unity of the canonical works. And this Spirit is eminently that of Truth. But there could not have

been truth in them, if they had been machines, automata; if, on subjects foreign to their inner life (as astronomy, or any part of science, or historical learning), they had talked or written anything but what they knew and believed, as good honest Jews or Christians, and as children of their parents and their country. And this is the real mischief which lies at the bottom of that view: it is as demoralizing to the mind as degrading to the intellect. I advise you, on the contrary, to look to your own experience and observation, in order to perceive the analogy which other phenomena of human nature show with prophetic vision and writing, and to understand the relation of the ecstatic state to the ordinary state of the mind. First of all look to the difference between the man who has formerly acted upon the selfish principle, and now acts upon the principle of moral responsibility, of duty and love to God and his brethren; in short, to the difference between what Scripture calls the natural, and the new or regenerate, man. Here the individual knows that he is the same man, but he feels a new principle of life in him, which can be so little explained by what he thought and did before, that it forms, on the contrary, the most striking contrast with it. But even in ordinary social life, have you not often seen a man say and do things far beyond his ordinary way of thinking and acting, and, as it were, out of his whole habitual existence? Why, the man has truth and reality in him: the inmost of his being, the mystery of his existence, is touched, a struggle for life and death ensues in him; and that which is in him of the divine nature, the infinite factor of his mental and intellectual life, overpowers all the dictates, warnings, misgivings of habit and ordinary prudence, and he will speak out and act as, we may well call it, an inspired man. Such analogies will not degrade your view of scriptural inspiration, but, on the contrary, elevate it from empty phrases, liable to be given up one day as vain superstition, into a feeling of reality and truth, which you did not know before.

"Nor will it be necessary now for me to add to my defence a word about the hackneyed phrase, thatsuch a view spiritualizes away the idea of revelation and inspiration; that is safer to keep

to the letter. Now, abstracting from the great Apostolic word, that the letter killeth, would to God those men, and they who preceded them, had only respected the letter of the prophetic writings! If they had, first of all they would have made greater efforts to understand it; and, secondly, they would have been ashamed to torture and distort the poor letter into their formularies, which are not only lying themselves, but which make the Bible lie. I say, on the contrary, my Christian friends, respect and study the letter, exactly as every letter in an author you respect, and more than any other. For, indeed, 'the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' That letter forms part of the spiritual centre of the history of mankind, of God's own history, showing the development and future destinies of his kingdom of truth, justice, and love upon this earth.

"I rejoice to see," I concluded, "that you signify your assent to that: but are you aware of the necessary consequences and corollaries?"

"I do not understand what you mean," replied my friend.

"I mean this," I said in explanation: "If Spirit be Reason, rational interpretation is the spiritual, and irrational is the materialistic; the one ministers to the Spirit, the other to the spirit-killing idolatry of the letter. If you have any thing to say against this, I am ready to reply to it."

Here our conversation on the three articles of faith seemed for the present exhausted. I asked indeed my young friend, whether he still wanted to know my opinion respecting the recent controversy on baptismal regeneration. But he replied:

"I see, you there would raise the previous question against them as they did against you; and I myself think, after what we have discussed, you would have a perfect right to do so. You might also say, you do not belong to our branch of the catholic Church: and," he added smilingly, "according to the philosophy of some of us, truth is of a local nature, subordinate to authority; therefore, what is truth here, may not be truth else-

where — at least, if Law makes truth. So we shall be satisfied with whatever you may feel disposed to say on the subject."

I cannot express how thankful I was for this liberal concession of my Christian friend's, and how much I felt relieved; for, of all things, that controversy has given me more trouble to understand than any other. So I said: "You are very kind indeed, and I shall simply state how the whole controversy would have appeared to us, in our days. We never defended the baptism of children, which in my time had only begun to be practised in some regions, unless it were as an exception and an innovation. Baptism of infants we did not know. Much less did we ever imagine that such an act could have any of those words of our Saviour applied to it which I see some attach to the external act of a simulacrum of the symbolical immersion, accompanied by the promissory act of third persons, which together they call Baptism. We, the old Fathers, should have considered such an opinion heretical, and any pretension to make it an article of faith an unwarrantable tyranny. But understand me well: I do not blame that arrangement of infant baptism in itself, unless it be in this respect, that it seems to me to have given rise to superstitious notions of magic influence, such as I have combated in refuting certain heretical sects which believed in sorcery and practised witchcraft. But if that so-called immersion is to be justified, it ought to be followed by what I, a bishop and a teacher of the Church, have considered, and do consider now, the principal part of that rite according to Christ's institution and to the Apostolic practice: I mean the solemn Christian pledge, not of other persons, but of the responsible Catechumen: a pledge, preceded, first by instruction, then by solemn examination in the faith, and finally by the public confession of the same before the whole Church, that is to say, his own congregation. I am not indisposed even to go further, and to praise such a change: there is nothing of such an act in the Bible, but I see in it an act of that Christian liberty which the Spirit sanctifies and even encourages. Why should not the original order of those acts, the totality of which constitutes that baptism which the Apostles and their disciples taught us, be inverted wherever there are Christian families and Christian schools for the young? But, beyond that, every thing

appears to me perfectly unintelligible, and I am sure would have been so to all Fathers in the East and West in our time, and still more to those before us. Knowing thus my view on this subject, I hope you will not urge me to enter into such an untoward discussion, which certainly would oblige me to move previous questions on both sides. For I should of all things dislike to be uncivil; and still, how can I say that sprinkling with water, followed perhaps by imposition of hands, without Christian examination and solemn pledge before the Christian congregation, is Baptism?"

Here my young friend, who had followed my words with beaming eyes and an intelligent smile, took my hand and said: "No, my good bishop and Father, I do not want you at all to enter into our controversies or squabbles, or whatever you may call them. But, to be sure, you cannot, after what you have said, expect us to go away without having been released from the last difficulty which we feel respecting the Apostolicity of your doctrine; pray, what did you mean by those words in the book on Antichrist respecting the Eucharist and the Sacrifice?"

"Well," I replied, "I see I shall not escape here. You touch upon every delicate and sacred point. But I do not know how to resist any challenge coming from you. Only tell me exactly what is the passage to which you refer."

"Here it is. In explaining the second verse of the ninth chapter of the Proverbs, and in particular the words, 'And she (Wisdom) prepared her own table,' you add, as mystical explanation: 'That is to say, the knowledge of the Holy Trinity which was promised, and His precious and pure Body and Blood which are daily celebrated on the mystical and divine table, and offered as sacrifice in memory of that ever memorable and first table of the mystic Divine meal.'"[13]

"Well, and what is there in this passage to shock your feelings or your orthodoxy?"

"You a sacrificer, my revered Father!" exclaimed my young friend; "you an abettor of transubstantiation!"

"Be a little more patient, my young friend," I replied; "and above all do not employ, in speaking to me, terms which I never heard, and which I have so much difficulty in understanding.

But as to sacrificing, do you not sacrifice whenever you meet? I am sure you do; for, in the Book of your Church, I was struck by one very beautiful prayer in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, where a pious father of yours says: 'Accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' And then he goes on to say: 'And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee.' I am afraid you have never meditated much upon what sacrifice means, and that is a great pity. For how can you comprehend what we, the old Christians, understood by sacrifice, and how can you really know what prayer and worship in spirit and truth is, unless you search diligently yourselves? and how can you search profitably without philosophy? Is not sacrifice an act of him who sacrifices?"

"Of course."

"Well, all the better, if you are clear so far. But to sacrifice, is it not to offer the life of a living being to God?"

"So it appears."

"To a Christian, can such an act be any thing but a symbolical act?"

"It certainly cannot mean suicide or human sacrifice."

"But you do not think the symbol grew out of nothing? A symbol is the expression of a reality."

"Undoubtedly it is."

"Well, then, can the reality, in the present case, be any thing else but the act of the mind, by which a man gives up Self-will? Is Self-will, as such, any thing but the power of disobeying God's will towards us and within us? and does not the conscious exercise of this Self-will constitute in our conscience an antagonism to, and a separation from, God, the native centre of our existence? Finally, must not the giving up of that Self-will be the spontaneous act of a self-responsible believing man; and, if it be expressed in the common worship, will it not be eminently his act, as that of a member of Christ's Church?"

"I do not see how it can mean any thing else, for it must have an objective reality."

"Look, now," I continued, "what a rich mine we seem to have opened. If it be certain, that in the real act of sacrifice subject

and object are the same, the formula of real sacrifice will be this: It is man sacrificing man, that is to say, himself; the priest and the victim being the same, to speak symbolically. Such indeed is the case, and the crime of human self-sacrifice, the greatest aberration of the misguided human mind, viewed in this light, turns out to be the most natural act of all false, that is to say, of perverted, religion. The abomination of parents sacrificing their children to Moloch, is only explicable by the depth of the idea thus perverted. Human sacrifices are nothing but the unmitigated natural reflection of the instinct of worship, in a mind driven to madness by despair or by vice, or by disordered fanaticism about divine things. For, discarding images and symbolical language, as philosophers ought to do, must we not say that sacrifice is adoration, and that the Christian sacrifice is the Christian worship? I understand by adoration that distinctive act, which is the direct expression of the feeling or consciousness of the eternal relation of the soul to the all-pervading immortal Cause of the Universe. This act is man's direct language to God, his speech to the living author of his existence; an act, not of habit or of tradition, or ever invented by wise men for the rest of mankind, but the very primitive native impulse and manifestation of the mind, directing itself by inward irresistible power, to the magnetic centre of all Spirits; the pulsation of the eternal life of man during his pilgrimage through the valley of time, the divine witness of his connection with, and dependence upon, his Maker. There is besides in worship the demand for something: there is thanking for something, there is also the building up of the many into one in the spirit by doctrine and exhortation. All these ingredients are congenial to adoration, and necessary for rational and complete common worship, but they are not essential to worship. In one word, as there is no religion without worship, so also is there none without sacrifice, and therefore without priesthood and priests. Is it not so?"

"So it would appear."

"Now, having cleared up this point, the course of the argument will faithfully lead us to a full understanding of the matter, as far as our present conversation is intended to go.

What, then, is unphilosphically called sacrifice of thanksgiving would better be termed among divines, the thankful offering which the believer makes of his Self-will to God, resigning it to His holy will, and aspiring to be thus reunited to God."

"What else should it be," exclaimed my young friend, "if we discard symbolical language, and try to understand the real meaning of Scripture, of language, and of ourselves!"

"The Christian sacrifice, therefore," I continued, "could never have been any thing but this; and indeed never was, as in particular my blessed teacher Irenæus endeavoured always to impress upon us."

"But," asked my friend, "would the true Christian sacrifice be an act independent of the Communion?"

"This question," I replied, "must be answered according to the sense you attach to it. Evidently, it is so in itself. For the sacrifice is an act, and the receiving of the Communion is the contrary. They are connected only as the two opposite poles, the one of the highest activity, and the other of the highest receptivity. But that, certainly, well considered, says much. Tell me, could we offer ourselves up to God as thankful children of his, if Christ had not lived and died for us?"

"Certainly not as children, and therefore not willingly, nor intellectually."

"Now, consider this," I said; "all the nations before Christ offered sacrifices, the Gentiles as well as the Jews, did they not?"

"So we read."

"And were not their sacrifices either those of atonement, intended to propitiate the offended Deity, or those of thanksgiving, destined to express thankfulness for benefits received from the propitious Divinity?"

"They were."

"But do you think this intention could ever be perfectly realized? Must not the dread of punishment, inherent in the feeling of sin and of wrong, have been a hindrance to perfect thankfulness? And again, could they really find relief in acts of propitiation, however often repeated, as long as that feeling of thankfulness was not perfect?"

"Undoubtedly not."

"So far, then," I continued, "Jews and Gentiles stood upon the same ground of an unsatisfactory and unsatisfied religious feeling. But Christ did offer himself up to the Father, in perfect love of God and of the brethren?"

"That is the foundation of our faith, as we have seen."

"This, then, was the first perfect sacrifice, or the first satisfactory act of self-devotion."

"Such it was, as being the great fact of the world's mental history."

"Well, if that be conceded, I must ask a further question. Is it not most natural that the vow of self-sacrifice should be made when we remember that Christ died for us, which we do in the Communion?"

"It certainly is; for otherwise we should show ourselves unmindful of the cause of our religious peace, and of our consciousness of being children of God."

"This is precisely what we thought in our time; and as we were very anxious to express this most solemnly, we used always to connect this eucharistic act, or act of thanksgiving, with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which consequently was itself called the Eucharist or the Thanksgiving. But if the act of the self-sacrifice of the Church (of the united worshippers) cannot be undertaken and consummated without a thankful remembrance of Christ's sacrifice for her, it does not at all follow, that this act cannot be performed in the service except when the Communion is celebrated, that is to say, when there is a congregation of communicants. I confess that seeing what an incredible confusion has flowed from this inseparable connection, and, to use a pathological phrase, what a metastasis of the centre of religious consciousness has been the final consequence, I cannot help thinking it would have been better to express and to celebrate that act of thanksgiving not only in the Communion, but also separate from the same, quite by itself, as the real act of worship, the action in the eminent sense, the acme or culminating point of our common devotion. But certainly, in spite of our having given some colour and pretext for such a perversion by the arrangement we came to, you will

soon find out the truth, if you only study the most ancient records of our holy worship with a little more philosophy than that excellent antiquarian work contains which you are used to consult on the subject. For the act of thanksgiving begins clearly with that old solemn exhortation, 'Lift up your hearts,' and the words which follow have absolutely nothing to do with the Communion as such. Moreover, the ancient liturgies are full of evidence to show that this act was quite distinct from the commemoration of Christ's death of atonement, which is the Communion. But what I am certain of is, that the fathers of your doctrine, however well they asserted the truth negatively against Callistus' successors, remained, without being aware of it, in the bondage, and, as it were, within the magic circle, of later Rome, in consequence of the method they themselves employed in proving the true doctrine of the Eucharist from Scripture and from the Fathers."

"This is a hard saying," replied my friends, "against such men as Luther and Calvin and our own Protestant divines, and how do you justify it?"

"You shall soon see, and, I hope, say the same," I replied. "Did not the whole controversy of your fathers with the Roman Church turn upon the question, what the consecrated elements (as you call them) become, or do not become, by certain words being spoken over them? I must be strangely mistaken, if that was not, and is not, the controversial point: for everybody, at Lugdunum as well as here, asks me that question, and I for my life cannot give any answer to it."

"How! you say that you cannot answer it?" exclaimed the elder friend, horrified.

"Indeed, how should I? Nobody in our time ever put that question to himself or to his neighbour. We offered up, at the celebration of the memory of the Lord's Supper (as the Jews of old did at their daily meals), the fruits of the earth and the produce of the vine as symbols of the sacrifice of ourselves; but then we considered two of them, bread and wine, according to Christ's command, as the representatives of the body and blood of Christ, that is to say, of the willing sacrifice of Him who died for us, to make us children of God. This

second view became more and more the predominant and then the exclusive one, the material meal being gradually dropped in the service. The destruction of Jerusalem showed the Christians that the temple-worship was over, that the world was to last longer, and that the sacrifice was destined to become and was becoming already, a reality in mankind, as it had become one in Christ, that it was growing in the thanksgiving, as it was consummated in the atonement. What had always been understood was now therefore expressed. The Church, that is to say, the congregation of worshipping believers, offered up herself; but she did so in thankfully remembering Christ's death, as the foundation of her prayer to the Father.

"Keep to this, and I have no doubt you will at once understand all that the Fathers have said. For however they may have expressed themselves, they must have spoken from this consciousness of the self-sacrifice of the Church as a sacrifice of thankfulness. But this sacrifice was offered up to God through Christ as the High Priest, in the very act of the commemoration of His willing death of love, which is the sacrifice of atonement. We are therefore also entitled to say that the body and blood of Christ, that is to say, the Church, was offered up: but by whom? by Christ as the head of his Church: and as what? as thanksgiving. Thus, later Fathers may have said that there was the real presence of Christ in the celebration of the Sacrament; but how else than in the minds of the faithful united into one by the Holy Spirit, and offering their prayer and vow of thankful self-sacrifice? In all this we and our followers never dreamt of speaking of the perishable elements, which have no more objective reality than subjective. For in excluding this consideration, we were not one-sidedly taking a subjective view, nor could we guess that later dark ages would so entirely lose sight of the centre of Christian consciousness as to mistake matter, subject to corruption, destined for food, for the only objective reality which exists in religion, the incorruptible God.

"The most sober way of stating our view historically would be something like this. There are in truth only two real sacrifices in the world's history: the Sacrifice of the historical Christ,

offered through a life of holiest action and a death of purest love; and the Sacrifice of the Church, that is to say, of faithful humanity in the succession of generations, offering up itself in childlike thankfulness through life and death, and expressing this as the Christian vow in the act of common adoration. Now, as the one sacrifice, the sacrifice of atonement, which the nations before Christ, disturbed in their consciences by sin, and by their consequent estrangement from God, and not initiated in the mystery of eternal love, had vainly and madly endeavoured to achieve, was accomplished by Christ; so the other, which neither could they accomplish, not having in them the feeling of children of the all-loving Father, is in the way of accomplishment, as the great sacrifice of thanksgiving, or of thankful self-devotion, during the course of ages. It is the sign of the growth of the mystical (that is to say, spiritual) body of Christ, of the advancement of the kingdom of God upon earth, of the ever-continuing incorporation of mankind in God. The Church in the spiritual and intellectual sense of the word, more or less imperfectly represented by the congregations of the faithful, is both the sacrificing priest and the victim offered up. For she is the ideal sacrificer, the acting person, acting by the Spirit of Christ in her; and by her reality, by all the individuals worshipping together and making the common vow with individual responsibility, she is equally the object offered up.

"But, if all this be certain (and it is certain), however differently expressed, we the Fathers, having enacted and tried this sacrifice, and knowing by experience that it was, and must ever be, the centre of Christian religion, in life and in worship, might well be tempted to use the most symbolical phrases in speaking of this mystery of Humanity uniting itself to Divinity. For who, contemplating these mysteries of divine love, this intercommunion between God and man, this continued and uninterrupted pulsation of divine life upon earth through worship in spirit and truth, would not feel elevated, and, as it were, carried away by so divine a sight? Or who, perceiving, as it were, in his mind this intellectual harmony of the spheres, and joining in the perpetual hymn of mankind which they are offering up as their generations pass through the dark valley of time,

enlightened from above, who, I say, would not feel tempted to use high and mysterious language?

"One thing only is as impossible as that the Spirit of God should not be the Spirit of Truth; the organs of the life of the ancient Church could never think of the Church offering up Christ, who suffered death upon the cross. This would in her eyes have been an absurdity, a contradiction, and a blasphemy. She in Christ, through his Spirit, offered up herself: this was and is, and (mark that well) this ever will be the reality, the great reality, of all life, all history, and all religion. This is the worship in the Spirit, and in truth. This is the reasonable service recommended by the Apostle.[14] As this act was accomplished in the midst of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in commemoration of Christ's death, very strong expressions indeed might be used, in the commemorative service, respecting the bodily food prepared for our maintenance, in what may be called the Grace, or the dinner prayer, of the Church. Bread and wine were offered to God objectively, as gifts from His gifts, and subjectively, as symbols of the worshipping faithful, offering up their heart and will. At the same time, too, Christ's sacred words of institution were remembered in the Communion service: 'This is my body,' and, 'This is my blood.' Now with respect to these words (of which the latter is parallel with 'This is the new covenant in my blood'), the offered gifts were also called 'The body and blood of Christ.' Still in this there is no sacrifice, because sacrifice is action, while here is historical commemoration first, bodily receiving afterwards. Pray observe that this difference is an essential one, decisive for the whole character, not of the service only, but of religious thought and action also. If the Church had ever thought that in her act of sacrifice Christ was the victim offered up, she would have lost the sacrifice intrusted to her—her life, and the manifestation of her life—thankful self-devotion. To suppose that by such an act she performed a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ, once and for ever consummated, is to misunderstand her completely. Nothing was ever farther from her thoughts. She would have felt as if she denied Him, the efficacy and perfection of whose atonement she would thus have assumed to re-enact, as it were,

by a dramatic representation. Indeed you cannot substitute the receiving for the acting, passiveness for activeness, without losing activeness and the act.

"Certainly, of all the pains and difficulties I encountered at Lugdunum, none were equal to the bewilderment which seized me when I heard them say that the doctrine of the Church had always been, that the Eucharist was a sacrifice of propitiation: whereas I knew, first, that it was no sacrifice whatever, but that its celebration was connected with the self-sacrifice of the Church; and then, that the propitiation having been made (the feeling of the love of God having been established once and for ever by the propitiatory act of Christ's sacrifice of Himself), the impulse of the Church was, to the end of days, the uninterrupted offering of self out of thankful love to God and the brethren. Strange discussions followed. At first we did not understand each other at all. Afterwards I found that the prayers of consecration, or the prayers preceding the Communion, had in the wane of the life of the Church, gradually become the principal part of the celebration of the service; the service being more and more celebrated, though without a communicating congregation, exactly as if there were a real Communion of the congregated faithful. Thus at last I could understand how, in the course of centuries, that preparatory act of the commemorative celebration of the Lord's Supper appeared to the reflective mind, taking this to be a divinely established ordinance, as the central thought of the Church, and as the culminating point of her worship. Thus that complete metastasis, or change of the centre of consciousness, can be historically explained.

"The Apostolic Church consecrated by prayer the communicants, who devoted body and soul to the Lord: the later Church consecrated the elements, bread and wine. And it was evidently out of this misplaced centre of consciousness that their bishops, assembled in the last great council of the Latin Church, made that awful declaration, which sounds to me like a sentence of death for poor Christianity, or rather like the bell tolling for the dead, as far as the effect of speculative doctrines and liturgical ordinances can go to pervert the indestructible element of

truth which is in that solemnity and in the religious feeling of the Christian mind.

"Now, do you not see that the whole question of transubstantiation or no transubstantiation, of real presence or no real presence, is an 'aprosdionyson,' something uncongenial to the sacred subject? It does not touch the centre of the controversy at all. Looking then on these terms from that consciousness which I had in me, when praying at the altar and receiving or administering the Communion, and which I feel too at this moment as strongly as ever, I say: 'O yes, there is the real presence, the only reality in the spiritual world, Christ is there with and by his Spirit; and there is a change of substance, of natural will and life into the divine will and life, a change of Self into God. But it is in the faithful worshipper of God in Christ, whether the Sacrament be celebrated or not.' Nor is this a sentimental phrase descriptive of individual feeling, or a materialized symbolism forgetful of the reality, but the great act of God in the life and consciousness of the generations of mankind. As to the elements, elements they are and remain, as the water prayed over remains water in the baptismal bath. Can you imagine that we, the Fathers of the Apostolic Church, who had heard the divine Apostle calling upon us to cast off the beggarly elements of the world in the full consciousness of the liberty of the children of God, that we, I say, ever thought of such vain speculations, or of combating any such late imaginations? or will you continue, yourselves, in that low view, merely because your fathers were not quite clear on the philosophy and history of the doctrine of the Sacrament, at the epoch when they returned, divinely inspired, to the evangelic ordinances? What have you to do with scholastic speculations respecting conventional ordinances, generated out of misplaced consciousness, and resting altogether upon misunderstandings?

"But, I repeat, I never will enter into your controversies. You are, or you ought to be, the prophets and teachers of your time—not I. I may be your mirror; I speak as, what I lived and died, a witness of the life of the Church, in the centre of the ancient Western world, one hundred years after the last Apostle died. Let me then sum up what I have said in defence of what appeared to you startling. You must not expect me

to defend the positive part of your eucharistic and of your sacramental doctrine altogether, for I cannot help considering that as merely accidental: nor is the Lutheran view in particular so much that of Luther himself as of his dogmatizing and scholasticizing followers, he himself having in his earlier writings, on the contrary, expressed better than any one else the real nature of the Christian sacrifice. But if the controversy about the elements was three hundred years ago an imperfection, it is now in every respect an anachronism. Your fathers, in combating the Latin Church, placed themselves in that very false centre of consciousness out of which the error had sprung. You cannot mean to do any such thing. Know that if you do, you will be driven into the nets of Rome. But throw away all dispute about the elements, and seize the ever-living, the Christian, and Apostolic idea of the everlasting sacrifice of the Church, the real expression of the great mystery of life, and the key to the understanding of Scripture and of the world's history."

A solemn pause followed. We felt we were brethren, but we also felt that our conversation had reached the point where it ought to stop. Meditation and inquiry were necessary before we could proceed.

After a while, the younger one of my friends, who had an inquisitive mind, and seemed more advanced in his meditations than appeared at first, asked me a question of which I do not quite understand the drift, but which I could not decline answering.

"We will consider," he said, "maturely what you have spoken to us so solemnly on this sublime subject. But I am sure you will not think I ask questions out of idle curiosity, if I request you to conclude this our conversation by one word respecting a certainly very startling, and perhaps most important expression of yours, which relates to what we passed over when touching upon the second article. In some writings, and also in particular in the book the authorship of which you are come

to vindicate, you say that the resurrection is, as it were, one of the sufferings, or at least one of the passive states, if I may say so, of Christ. Do you attach any importance to that opposition between the death and the resurrection?"

"One word," I replied, "may indeed suffice to answer that question. I am not aware that I did attach any importance to that distinction. Still, on reflecting upon the subject, I do not think it was merely a rhetorical figure. I was right, I am sure, in distinguishing between what are Christ's actions, his own deeds, the manifestation of his free-acting will and mind, and whatever happened to him or about him, and wherein consequently he was passive. This last may be a confirmation of our faith, or a symbolical expression of some ideal truth, but it ought not, I think, to be identified with his life-working, ever life-creating, and regenerating spontaneous actions. They alone have, under the immediate working of God, effected our salvation, as far as it is the act of Jesus: their power continues by the sanctifying agency of the Spirit, through saving faith. We are saved by what Christ did, not by what was done to Him: but what He did, the Father did in Him. What saves us is his free resolution to work our salvation, his actual life of holiness, and, above all, his death of self-sacrifice; and here again his holy resolution to die, more than all the pains he endured."

My enlightened Judges, I make a pause here, for I see the time allowed to me is past. I therefore ask whether you will grant me permission to go on for a few minutes longer, and whether you will hear me on my defence respecting my Christian temper and my exclusiveness? And besides, whether you have yourselves some questions to put to me before you give your verdict?

I perceive that you will be kind enough to allow me a few minutes more to complete my defence, and I have just

heard a remark, which will give me a good opportunity of passing on to what I have still to say before I conclude my Apology.

Somebody near me observes, that there is a general impression among you, that I have introduced into the discussion, if not German philosophy, at least German terminology, and that I am considered as one who has himself been bewitched by the siren song of one of those philosophers and philosophical theologians. I know that this suspicion will create a strong prejudice against me in this country, but this must not prevent me from speaking to you with the utmost frankness on this subject also. Let me say first, that they who have hitherto written against the Germans in your country have evidently either not studied them at all (and that indeed I believe to be the case with the greater number), or have not understood the subject-matter of all such speculations: at least if we, the Fathers and the Apostles, ever had any philosophy in us. On the whole, your judgment of these people seems to me strange. You allow that those extraordinary men have reasoned well on many other subjects, and have discovered undoubted truths, both in history and philosophy. But whenever they treat of the highest speculative questions, such as the laws of the human mind, you say you do not understand them; which I find to be a polite English expression implying that you will not listen to them, because you think them mad, or, at least, because you do not care to know anything about the subject itself. And when they begin to reason on divinity, you call them, if very polite, Enthusiasts, if plain-spoken, Pantheists, which with you means Atheists. Now has it never struck you, that what makes the speculation on things divine so unpalatable to you may be your own materialism? This indeed is what other people very generally think. As to myself, I believe I can say with a good conscience that I have essentially told you no more than what I find in myself, and of which I can render you account by my own writings. But as you mention the subject, I will not conceal from you, that I have seen on my way to you some good and pious learned men in Germany, who excited my deepest interest by asking me questions which no one else has asked me

either before or since. I confess to you also, that they appeared to me to be men caring most anxiously for Christ and for divine things, since they have evidently sacrificed all worldly considerations for their studies; and their zeal, and their profound knowledge of the ancient schools of philosophy in the second and third centuries after Christ, struck me the more, when I considered that the successor of my venerable master Irenæus, at Lugdunum, and all his clergy, did really know very little of the Greek Fathers, and understood nothing of the language in which the glorious martyr of their town had taught and written.

But, on the other hand, I am free to confess those German Christians puzzled me much in another way. Many of them would never give me a clear and distinct answer, when I put a positive question to them, as to what final consequences they drew from their premises, and as to the connection in their mind between theoretical speculation and the organization of their Church, and in general the wants and demands of their own people. At first I thought they were not in earnest with their convictions. But then I found they considered that scientific thought alone belonged to them, and the consideration of applying these results practically belonged to others, or to other times. Yea, in spite of the evident confusion of their ecclesiastical as well as political affairs, those very persons seemed to think least of all this who devoted their lives to attempting the solution of the most important inquiries into the past. No doubt, there were others, whom I found intent upon carrying out practical and useful Christian ideas; but then they were generally men of rather narrow minds, and little spirit. Those who pleased me best would sometimes puzzle me incredibly, by endeavouring to make me believe that, as a dogmatic philosopher, I ought myself necessarily to have arrived at, or at least ought to adopt now, those conclusions and that terminology which, they showed me, the councils had made out about that very time when, as I had interpreted the prophecies of our Blessed Apostle, Antichrist would build up the Jewish temple. After all, was I quite so wrong in this guess? But however that be, I told them they would not,

after all, when they came to the end, know what to do with those formularies of the later councils. It was all very well when they had found out and demonstrated that there was a thread in all the disputes and formularies following upon the council of Nicæa; and, having raised certain questions on the relation of the divine and human natures in Christ, they were very naturally driven to decide on their logical consequences, as long as any attempt was made to break through the barrier thus interposed between the consciousness of the earlier Church and that of the later age. There was in the history of those controversies a logical connection, which did not however prove that the final result was anything but what, in our old chemistry, we used to call *caput mortuum*, or that the formularies were not tombstones of once living ideas. At last I said this: "My Christian friends, I have quarrelled so much in my former existence, that I have no mind to quarrel even with the successors of Callistus, much less with you, who love Christ so truly, and who show such deep Christian feeling and philosophy, and so much sympathy for the thoughts of the ancient Church about the revelation of things divine in and through Christ. But this I will say: till I see more clearly than I can at present, that the terminology of the councils does not obscure to my mind what the prologue of John's Gospel and the glorious passages in Paul's Epistles teach me respecting Christ and the Spirit, I shall abstain from adopting it in preference to my own expressions, and to those of my blessed master Irenæus."

One lesson I received from them, for which I hope I am thankful. I felt deeply humbled before them. There was no one, either catholic or heretic, about whom they knew and cared so little as about myself. Some of them had restored most faithfully and successfully the old genuine text of the New Testament which we once read, I as well as Origen: but while they give all the quotations occurring in Origen, they give none of mine. As to myself, personally, they believed I was a man of the West, it might be of Portus: but about my further doings, and, in particular, my doctrinal writings, they with few exceptions cared very little, saying they must wait till it was

more authentically known what I really did say and do. One had made out that I did not write the treatise against Noetus; another that I was an Alexandrian! Indeed I think they might have discovered something better.

Still these men of sober research and Christian thought were by far the best among the Germans I met on my way. For there were others in the South, who seemed to me to be seized with some peculiar mania of overturning Christianity without openly and frankly saying they had given it up, or at least its records. According to them, John's Gospel had been written shortly before Irenæus wrote: whereas I know positively from Hegesippus and Irenæus, that it was edited by the bishop and elders of Ephesus, who were present at the writing of it, themselves read it through, and then published it with some remarks of their own. Have I not read and discussed the observations of Basilides and Valentinus upon it, written almost a hundred years before my time? But still I soon found that the leaders of that school were not only very serious philosophers and deeply learned, but also conscientious men, anxious to find the truth, and that I was quite mistaken when I first thought they would make a fool of me, or were frivolous and irreligious people. I certainly pitied them for plaguing themselves and their readers with suspicions and guesses about deep party schemes and intrigues in the old time, which never existed among the simple, good, old Fathers. But they (and still more their followers) had made a sort of novel or romance of all that, and whoever did not believe in it was a fool or a Jesuit. Altogether they were difficult to deal with. For, being both learned men and philosophers by profession, they would not hear of anything which was against their theory, whether of argument or fact. When I humbly ventured to observe to them, that they certainly must be wrong in their chronology of the second century, for those were things which I ought to know better, and upon which, besides, I had studied and written expressly, they said, with a smile which seemed to me less Christian than it was forbidding, and in phrases which certainly were neither Apostolic nor Attic: "You had better be quiet, for there is a great doubt whether you ever existed; and if you

did, whether you are not a confirmed papist, and are not travelling now as a Jesuit in disguise, which indeed your coming from Lugdunum is almost sufficient to prove." So I left them with the impression that they were not very civil, but exceedingly confident: as philosophers, they appeared to me men proceeding upon the principle of placing, for the sake of experiment, every thing on its head, in order to set it right. The fact is, they were anxious to get rid of an old system, and thought they could not succeed without entering upon their inadmissible hypotheses, and thus they fell into uncritical hypercriticism. That Christianity is not a system for speculation, but a message for life, and that knowledge is to be tested by life, and religion by an humble feeling of our own imperfection and deficiency, and of the sinful nature of Self, of all this they seemed to have entirely lost sight, some even of the reality of sin.

Thus you see, whatever may be the merit of my speculations, they are not borrowed from the Germans, but are my own. If I have, with your own approval, here and there adopted their terminology, I have done so because it appeared reasonable: and, at all events, nobody among you knew how to propose a better, which we might have adopted in preference.

I think I have succeeded in apologizing in some manner for what you were disposed to deride as my fanciful interpretations, and in justifying what you suspect to be incorrect in my doctrine and terminology. But now I understand you doubt of my being a good Christian for another reason, and that is one which goes very near my heart. I have heard some of you say that, if I did indeed write that book, I must have been an ill-tempered man, as I made use of very strong and angry words against my own bishop. Others say that in my controversies I am much too exclusive: an objection indeed already implied in the former one. Allow me to defend myself against both charges. I would say, in the first place, that I spoke not against Callistus, as the bishop of Rome (I myself being, by the by, a bishop as well as

himself), but because he was a tyrant and an oppressor of our presbytery; and that I judged him so severely, not simply because he was a heretic, but because he was dishonest. As to the other points, let us consider a little what we mean by heretic. The successors of Callistus (as I understand) consider every man a heretic who will not acknowledge as true, in point of fact and in philosophy, every thing that they have made into doctrine: even though he should accept, or be ready to accept, what in those old councils the majority of bishops have laid down as true, and as necessary to be believed under pain of eternal damnation. As for those who will not acknowledge the supreme authority of the bishop of Rome over all Churches (of which even Callistus did not dream), they are called by the bishop of Rome, as I hear, schismatics, and are looked upon as equally separated from the body of the Church. Now I certainly never went so far, although I am aware I extended the ancient notions of heresy in my own controversies. But the ancient heretics were men of a very different sort. They placed in jeopardy not speculations, but the very existence of Christianity; for either they did not acknowledge the authority of the evangelical and apostolical writings at all, introducing instead false books of their own making, or else they mutilated the Scriptures, interspersing them with extracts from other books in support of some favourite speculative scheme. Their sole intention was to substitute for the whole community of believing people (which we at that time used to call the Church, and which you now call a Christian nation), a philosophical sect, privileged on account of their superior knowledge. Instead of our simple worship, our short prayers, our plain and popular homilies on evangelical and Apostolical texts; instead of our symbolic baptism, preceded by solid Christian instruction and by the evidence of a Christian life, conferred after a solemn and public confession of faith; instead of our brotherly feasts of love, and our humble sacrifice of thanksgiving and of self, that ever-continuing sacrifice of redeemed mankind, offered up and to be offered up in remembrance of Christ's atoning death;—instead of all this, they introduced unintelligible formularies, full of superstitious words; they invented fanciful baptisms,

and used orgies borrowed from heathen mysteries, which soon degenerated into the most impure and abominable practices. Thus we and our fathers had not to fight either for our own speculations, or against mere systems of pantheism and mythological fancies; nor did we defend our power and jurisdiction only; we fought absolutely for the existence of the Christian Church. I confess at the same time that my more recent adversaries, the Noetians, and still more the Montanists and the poor unmanageable Quartodecimans, certainly stood with us on evangelical ground. So that all I have to blame myself for is, the having treated as heretics some men and parties of my own time, or the age immediately preceding me, who were indeed not at issue with us on any vital and essential point. I plead guilty at once. I own I was wrong: I ought not to have done so.

But, my dear brethren, let there be truth between us. Will you pardon me, if I remind you of what the Saviour said respecting the beam and the mote in the eye? Are you sure that you are not doing the very same thing, and perhaps worse? Do your laws not exclude all your foreign Protestant brethren from the use of your churches? and do you not (so far as you identify yourselves with the majority of your clergy) exclude, or at least assume the right of excluding, from the universal Church (which is communion with Christ), all the Protestant Churches on the Continent, even those from which your fathers gloried that they received their principles, and whose tenets they adopted when at last they took courage to declare openly their religious opinions under the tyranny of a wicked prince? And why? Because those nations have not adopted that episcopal form of government which is yours, a form disliked by the others exactly because you make an idol of it, and because it renders you so superstitious and exclusive. Are you not, in doing so, or in allowing your clergy to do so, more tyrannical than even Callistus was, or his successors are? For they are consistent, you contradict your own principles; they are exclusive from necessity, you by choice; they never accepted the paramount authority of Scripture, you do.

I correct myself: you laymen do not think and feel so. I

never found one in a hundred of the laity who really did: most of them, on the contrary, lamented, as much as I do, that one half of your clergy are come to so narrow a view of Christianity, and that your laws themselves are so imperfect and insular. Therefore against their intolerance alone have I spoken these words: and even against them only in my defence.

And now I leave my case in your hands. Whatever you may think of me and of my equals and betters, know that we were frail and imperfect beings, such as you are. But do not forget one thing. Whatever we knew or knew not, and whatever were or were not our faults and our sins of commission or omission, we did not talk Christ and Christianity, but we lived them.[15] And when the liberties of the world were gone, when Stoic despair was all that seemed left of belief in self-responsibility and of faith in the moral government of human affairs, we the Christians resolved not to do what we thought against our conscience. We sought no subterfuge when the men in power said we must sacrifice to the idols, in obedience to the laws of the state: we said those laws are unjust, because they are against the light of the Spirit and the law of God, which is in Scripture and in us. We said so, knowing such conduct was death, even in the eyes of a Pliny and a Trajan: and we died. So I too lived and died for the saving faith; and, in doing so, I then felt, and I have known since, that I was blessed.[16]

I died for our common faith in Christ, I died to satisfy my conscience, and in the hour of death I looked up to my heavenly Father, and to his eternal kingdom of truth and of liberty. But I now see, as you might know, that, by my confession and martyrdom, I have contributed my share towards laying the foundation of that civil and religious liberty which you in this land are enjoying, and for which, I hope and trust, you are, and ever will be, sincerely thankful.

For remember, and such shall be my parting prophetic word to you, remember that you would not possess this liberty, if the

Christian martyrs had not rendered to humanity that self-respect which is founded on respect for the truth in God, and for the divine dignity of his image on earth; nor unless they had given the example of that courage, which springs from love for mankind as our brethren. By that faith and by that courage we educated you and the whole Germanic race, when you entered, youthful but ignorant, upon the stage of the world, the face of which you were destined to renew. Remember also, that you would not have been able to secure to yourselves, and to the world, the liberties you now enjoy, unless your fathers had risked their lives and shed their blood for the maintenance of these same principles, three hundred years ago.

And now, be worthy of your fathers and true to yourselves, and fear not the issue of the great religious and social struggle which is drawing near. The enemies of liberty of conscience, who wish to use the civil liberties you have so dearly gained, for introducing again sacerdotal encroachment and tyranny, are impotent, if you combat them with the weapons of the Spirit and of Light. Their days are numbered. The history of the world runs against them like a mighty spring-flood of heaven. Their failure and their judgment are written with letters of blood in the history of the world down to this your day. They have no living root in the past and present, and none therefore in the future. The present state of that world which they have taught and influenced cries to heaven against them with blood and tears and sighs; and the confusion around them becomes every day more and more confounded. They sowed the counter-reformation three hundred years ago, and they have reaped revolutions wherever that seed took root: they lighted up civil war and kept it burning for one hundred and fifty years; and now, wherever they reign, there is rebellion, anarchy, or tyranny: they are at this moment sowing a bloody counter-revolution, and they will reap destruction. They suppressed or spoiled the first Reformation, which was compelled to fight them with only the scanty light that they had provided, and with the crippled resources that they had left to the human mind. Thus, the first Reformation itself remained crippled and maimed, among you and everywhere else. Since

that great event, the European nations have been occupied in forming a free polity out of the traditions of Byzantine and modern despotism, into which they had been gradually sinking: for with the present world, as with the ancient, despotism is new, and liberty old.

But the times are changed. The apostles of darkness cannot stand the second Reformation, which draws near in the armour of Divine Light, and with the weapons of eternal conscious reason; which is fortified by science, philosophy, and authentic history; the approach of which is anticipated and hailed by the universal longing of nations, yearning after Christ and evangelical truth and liberty. The second Reformation advances, not by revolutionary infidelity as they pretend, but in spite of that universal scepticism and unbelief which their unholy impositions, forgeries, and frauds have prepared and fostered in the finest countries of the world. The second Reformation will conquer, not by exciting wars or fomenting revolutions, but peaceably, and in spite of the bloody disturbances grown out of the infidelity sown by its enemies; not by flattering the popular mind, but in spite of the reaction called forth by late revolutionary movements in many noble, but timid minds, ready to catch at anything which promises them the support of religious authority.

Fear not any of these obstacles. The history of the world advances under laws, as eternal, positive, and unchangeable, as those by which the heavenly bodies move, but more sublime and divine; because they are the direct and conscious expression of that mind which is eternal reason and love. Neither fear ye the apostles of irreligion and antichristianism, who go about preaching to the nations the emancipation of animal life as the liberty and happiness of man and of woman, and mad pantheism as the religion of the future. They are already sinking under the weight of their own wickedness and folly, and beneath the indignation and contempt of all nations. Show yourselves faithful, by believing that there is no wisdom but in Christ, and that no one has the Spirit of God and its power, except him who calling Jesus Lord and Master is an humble follower of His holy life. Those who deify sinful humanity are the worst

of idolaters, because they not only blaspheme the name of God, but profane the image of the most Holy on earth: they will share the fate of all idolaters; doomed by their own consciences, they will perish in madness or idiotcy.

But ye, the children of light, go fearlessly onward. To imagine a return of mankind to that infantine state, in which tradition and revelation are received as things external to man, is like seeking in the wilderness for Christ, who is near you and in you. Such a return is neither desirable nor possible. You have not to choose between faith and reason, nor between superstition and irreligion. But you have to make your choice between light and darkness. On that side are indifference, scepticism, servitude, and all the other attendant nightmares of humanity; on this side, self-responsibility, faithful inquiry, liberty, all the attending genii of light.

The first natural day of reformed theology and Protestant Church government is gone. Children of light! sit not in darkness and sleep not the sleep of death. Light your torches at that intellectual sunbeam in Scripture and within yourselves, which both nature and universal history majestically reflect; and awaken the dawn of the young day of the earth by intellectual hymns of praise, responded to by a life of self-sacrificing love for the growth and advancement of truth and justice among mankind, the only, but the indestructible, foundation of social union, of political freedom, and of all earthly happiness.

And with these words, I bid you farewell.

NOTES OF THE EDITOR

TO

THE APOLOGY OF HIPPOLYTUS.

Note to Title.

THE IDES OF AUGUST, THE DATE OF THE DEPOSITION OF THE REMAINS OF ST. HIPPOLYTUS.

The Ides of August are the day on which, in Rome, from very ancient times, the memory of Hippolytus, the bishop of Portus and presbyter of Rome, was celebrated. We must in this case, as in many others, not lay too much stress on the expression "dies natalis," which originally meant the day of martyrdom or confession. For very often, and particularly in the primitive times of the Church of Rome, the day celebrated was the "dies depositionis," or the day when the bones of the martyr and confessor were deposited in one of the Christian cemeteries of the city, and therefore principally in those "ad Catacumbas," afterwards called Cœmeterium Callisti, on the Appian road, near the present Church of St. Sebastian. I have shown, in the "Description of Rome" (vol. ii. Description of the old basilica of St. Peter), that as to the two princes of the Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, this results from the explicit evidence of bishop Damasus himself, and the collateral reports. The proof, in our present case, is contained in the very words of the old Roman Martyrologium (Fabric. i. p. xx.): "Idibus Augusti (13. Aug.) Romæ, natalis Sanctorum *Hippolyti Martyris*, *Pontiani Episcopi*, Cornelii," &c. The old Calendars published by Muratori in his Liturgia Romana all give the same date.

We know from the most ancient authentic record of the Church of Rome, the "Catalogus Liberianus" of the year 354 (I have given the text of the passage in the Letters), that Pontianus died an

exile in Sardinia, on the 28th September, of the first year of Maximinus, which corresponds to the year 235 of our era. Now, the very circumstance that one and the same day is mentioned as "dies natalis" for a number of saints, shows that this expression is incorrect; but not at all that it is in every case mythical and a fiction. Possibly there may have been an earlier deposition in the Catacumbæ, for an ancient Martyrologium has the following:

"8. Id. Aug. (6. Aug.) Romæ cœmeterii Callisti via Appia, natalis Sixti Episcopi, et Felicissimi Agapeti, Donatiani, Fausti, Pretextati, Laurentii, Hippolyti."

Still, the authority quoted is not sufficiently weighty to remove all doubt of its authenticity; whereas the deposition in the cemetery in the Ager Veranus, on the Tiburtine road, where the basilica of St. Laurentius stands, is attested already fifty years before Prudentius, as we have seen, by the Calendarium of the year 354.

The date now fixed for the festival of St. Hippolytus by the Roman Catholic Church, the 22nd of August (xi. Kal. Sept.), is consequently quite arbitrary. Indeed, it is of very late date, and perhaps rests only on the authority of Baronius. The prayers relating to St. Hippolytus, not only in the Gregorian Sacramentary, but also in those of Gelasius and Leo (or Felix III.), are all for the Ides of August. It is, therefore, quite accurate, that the day of commemoration ought to be the 13th of August. And, indeed, this date has been adopted in the official Christian calendar of Prussia, which, for the first time, has realized the idea of Luther as to the names and lives of the saints in the calendar. There the Christian reader will find Nicolaus Count Zinzendorf by the side of Hippolytus, and the days of the demise of William Wilberforce and of Elizabeth Fry by the side of those of St. Benedict and Sta. Scholastica. Dr. Piper has added to these names of Christian heroes and heroines popular but critically sifted accounts respecting their lives, substituting for the charm of fable the holier one of true history. So much for German infidelity on this score!

Note I. p. 255.

The three Hippolytuses whom the Church of Rome has made out of the one.

This curious fact is proved by the comparison of the account of Prudentius with the official documents of the Church of Rome. The "Martyrologium Romanum" (edited by command of Pope Gregory

XIII., and revised by order of Urban VIII.) has the following three articles, in which we distinguish by Italics the circumstances occurring in the account of Prudentius :

"1. Tertio Kal. Febr. (30. Jan.) Antiochiæ passio beati Hippolyti Presbyteri, qui *Novati schismate aliquantulum deceptus,* sed operante gratia Christi correctus, ad unitatem Ecclesiæ rediit, pro qua et in qua postea illustre martyrium consummavit. Hic rogatus a suis, quænam secta verior esset, execratus dogma Novati, *eam fidem dicens esse servandum, quam Petri cathedra custodiret,* jugulum præbuit.

"2. Idib. Augusti (13. August). Romæ beati Hippolyti martyris qui pro confessionis gloria sub Valeriano Imperatore, post alia tormenta, *ligatis pedibus ad colla indomitorum equorum* per carduetum et tribulos *crudeliter tractus, toto corpore laceratus* emisit spiritum.

"3. Undecimo Kal. Sept. (22. Aug.) In *Porta Romana S. Hippolyti Episcopi eruditione clarissimi,* qui *sub Alexandro Imperatore* ob præclaram fidei confessionem manibus pedibusque ligatis in altam foveam aquis plenam præcipitatus, martyrii palmam accepit : cujus corpus a Christianis apud eundem locum sepultum fuit."

The account of the mode of martyrdom is taken from the Greek legend published in the "Acta Martyrum sub Claudio Gothico," which I have had so often occasion to quote in the First Volume. There may have been no harm intended by all this : such confusions happen continually, not by fraud, but by the insufficiency of knowledge, and the injury of time. But there certainly is harm in the tyranny, first of canonizing legends into truth ; and secondly, of declaring infallible the canonizing authority ; for, if legends are made truth, truth will, sooner or later, be thought a legend, and historical belief superstition. And that is the case in Southern Europe.

Note 2. p. 258.

THE PRESENT SUCCESSOR OF ST. IRENÆUS.

Hippolytus evidently alludes to the present Cardinal de Bonald, bishop of Lyons, son of the celebrated De Bonald, who was a peer of the Restoration, and author of many theocratic and hierarchical writings. The cardinal-bishop is known by his pastoral Letter or Mandement, of 1842, about the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and her worship ; and by another of 1848, recommending the willing acceptance of the Republic. It is at Lyons, since the Restoration, that the

central committee of the Roman Catholic Missions in France resides, which, according to some published accounts, disposes yearly of some millions of francs.

Note 3. p. 258.

THE DEAN OF THE SACRED COLLEGE.

This evidently must have been meant in the sense of "Doyen d'âge:" for the "Decano del Sagro Collegio" is always the cardinal-bishop of Ostia. Different passages of the Liber Pontificalis prove that the bishop of Portus was one of the three suburban bishops who assisted the bishop of Ostia in consecrating the elect bishop of Rome.

Note 4. p. 259.

THE WORKS AND MONUMENTS OF PROTESTANTISM.

The reproach here made against Protestantism is very hackneyed in the whole school of the French hierarchical authors, as De Maistre, in his book "Du Pape," and the elder De Bonald. The same song has been sung, *ad nauseam*, by the English converts to Romanism. Their leader was the late Mr. Pugin, an ingenious architect, who humorously ridiculed the pigtail style, forgetting only that the decay of good taste in the churches and monuments, during the last 250 years, had its origin in Italy, through the influence of the Jesuits; and who, upon honest inquiry, would have discovered that the spirit of restoration, both in architecture and music, sprung everywhere from Protestant Germany, as well as that movement which, fifty years ago, led to the revival of historical painting.

Note 5. p. 260.

CICERO'S PROPHECY OF THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION AND OF ITS HISTORY.

Cicero (De Republica, lib. i.), after having established that there are three kinds (genera) of governments, the regal (regium), the aristocratic (optimatium), and the popular (populare), and that each is apt

to degenerate and to bring on great convulsions, has the following words, which nobody in our days will read without serious reflections.

(Cap. xxix.) "Miri sunt orbes et quasi circuitus in rebus publicis commutationum et vicissitudinum: quos cum cognosse sapientis est, tum vero prospicere impendentes in gubernanda re publica, moderantem cursum atque in sua potestate retinentem, magni cujusdam civis et divini pæne est viri. Itaque quartum quoddam genus rei publicæ maxime probandum esse sentio, quod est ex his, quæ prima dixi, moderatum et permixtum tribus. . . . . (Cap. xxxv.) "Tum Lælius, quid tu, inquit, Scipio? Ex tribus istis quid maxime probas? — *S.* Recte quæris quid maxime e tribus; quoniam eorum nullum ipsum per se separatum probo; anteponoque singulis illud, quod, conflatum fuerit ex omnibus. Sed si unum ac simplex probandum sit, regium probem atque in primis laudem. In primo autem genere quod hoc loco appellatur, occurrit nomen quasi patrium regis, ut ex se natis ita consulentis suis civibus, et eos conservantis studiosius quam redigentis in servitutem: ut sane utilius sit facultatibus et mente exiguos sustentari unius optimi et summi viri diligentia. Adsunt optimates, qui se melius hoc idem facere profiteantur; plusque fore dicant in pluribus consilii quam in uno, et eandem tamen æquitatem et fidem. Ecce autem maxima voce clamat populus, neque se uni neque paucis velle parere; libertate ne feris quidem quidquam esse dulcius; hac omnes carere sive regi sive optimatibus serviant. Ita caritate nos capiunt reges, consilio optimates, libertate populi: ut in comparando difficile ad eligendum sit quid maxime velis. . . . . (Cap. xlv.) "Quod ita cum sit, ex tribus primis generibus longe præstat mea sententia regium; regio autem ipsi præstabit id quod erit æquatum et temperatum ex tribus optimis rerum publicarum modis. Placet enim esse quiddam in re publica præstans et regale; esse aliud auctoritati principum patrum adtributum; esse quasdam res servatas judicio voluntatique multitudinis. Hæc constitutio primum habet æquabilitatem quandam magnam, qua carere diutius vix possunt liberi; deinde firmitudinem, quod et illa prima facile in contraria vitia convertuntur, ut exsistat ex rege dominus, ex optimatibus factio, ex populo turba et confusio; quodque genera ipsa generibus sæpe commutantur novis. Hoc in hac juncta moderateque permixta conformatione rei publicæ non ferme sine magnis principum vitiis evenit. Non est enim causa conversionis, ubi in suo quisque est gradu firmiter collocatus, et non subest, quo præcipitet ac decidet." (Text after Osann, without the archaic orthography.) The "quiddam præstans et regale" is evidently the Latin for "the royal prerogative." For the

last of these passages Mai quotes Polyb. vi. 3.: but the father of the whole idea is Aristotle, in his "Politics": see, in particular, iv. 6. 7. (al. 8. 9.)

Note 6. p. 265.

THE WIFE AND CHILDREN OF ST. HIPPOLYTUS.

The particulars here given are, of course, part of the fiction; but that Hippolytus might have had, and probably had, a wife and children, for which he might now be ridiculed by ignorant and malicious men as bishop Alexander was in our time, both in France and England, is an indisputable fact of ecclesiastical history; as we have shown in our First Volume. I take this opportunity of expressing my conviction that the tradition respecting St. Paul's having been a widower is true.

Note 7. p. 265.

THE INSCRIPTION OF HERON BELONGING TO THE TEMPLE OF SERAPIS AT PORTUS, OF THE TIME OF HIPPOLYTUS.

Under Severus, there lived at Portus a certain Heron, who in the inscription on a marble pedestal found at Portus, is mentioned as *νεωκόρος* or *ædituus* of the temple of Serapis in that place. This inscription is published in Sponii Miscellanea eruditæ Antiquitatis (Fabr. in Hipp. i. 47.):

Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Σευήρου Ἀλεξάνδρου εὐτυχοῦς εὐσεβοῦς καὶ Ἰουλίας Μαμαίας Σεβαστῆς μητρὸς Διὶ Ἡλίῳ μεγάλῳ Σαραπίδι καὶ τοῖς συννάοις θεοῖς Μ. Αὐρήλιος Ἥρων Νεωκόρος τοῦ ἐν Πόρτῳ Σαραπίδος ἐπὶ Λαργινίῳ Βειταλίωνι ἀρχιερέτῃ καὶ καμαινεύτῃ καὶ Αὐρηλίῳ Φήβῳ καὶ Σαλωνίῳ Οειδότῳ ἱεροφώνοις καὶ καμεινεύταις Χαριτὴ ἱεροβουλεία ἀνέθηκεν ἐπὶ ἀγαθῷ.

Du Cange has endeavoured to identify this Heron with a Heron "confessor et philosophus," who is mentioned with Hippolytus as chronographer. This is whimsical for a historian.

Note 8. p. 266.

CALLISTUS' RESIDENCE IN TRASTEVERE.

The church of S. Calisto at Rome, near to S. Maria in Trastevere, with the Convento di S. Calisto by its side, is given as the place where that bishop, as the legend says, took refuge in the time of persecution, and where he was thrown out of the window. (Beschreibung der Stadt Rom, iii. C. p. 672—677.)

Note 9. p. 267.

HIPPOLYTUS ON THE PARAMOUNT AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE.

See the proofs given in the Letters and in the Essay.

Note 10. p. 269.

THE PUNCTUATION OF THE FIRST VERSES OF THE PROLOGUE OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

All ancient authorities prove that the third and fourth verses were written thus:

"All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made. What was made is life in Him, and the life was the light of men."

The present punctuation was adopted in order to combat the heresy of the Macedonians, towards the end of the fourth century. Thus it has all tradition and ancient authorities against it. A deeper insight into the meaning of those sublime and, to a Christian philosopher, perfectly intelligible words, will show to the Christian reader that the internal evidence is as great as the external. The first words ("In the beginning was the Word," &c.) speak of the immanent external existence of the Word as God (as God's Thought of himself). Then comes the demiurgic or world-creating function of the Word, in the beginning of the third verse. It remains, therefore, to speak of the agency of the Word in the created universe. Here the Apostle says, first, that it is the principle of life in the outer world (the infinite

factor in nature); and equally was (originally) the intellectual principle in man (the infinite factor in the mind), enabling man to understand (when born anew) things divine and his own origin. More on this subject is said in the Philosophical Outlines.

Note 11. p. 270.

The Canon of the New Testament in the Roman Church in the age of Hippolytus.

See the proofs in the Essay on this subject.

Note 12. p. 272.

The belief of Hippolytus in the facts of clairvoyance, and his wise judgment upon this subject.

Of the Montanist prophetesses Hippolytus speaks in his great work. As to his belief in the facts connected with what is now called magnetism, I have shown it to be more than probable in my chapter on the Treatise on the Charismata, or Gifts of the Holy Spirit, that the Essay with which both texts of the eighth book of the "Apostolical Constitutions" open, represents substantially the introductory part of a book of Hippolytus on the Apostolic tradition respecting the Charismata. In this extract, his opinion on such points is distinctly stated.

Note 13. p. 314.

The passage of Hippolytus as to the sacrifice in the Eucharist.

The original text runs thus (Hipp. Opp. i. 282.): *Ἡτοιμάσατο τὴν ἑαυτῆς τράπεζαν· τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος κατεπαγγελλομένην, καὶ τὸ τίμιον καὶ ἄχραντον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μυστικῇ καὶ θείᾳ τραπέζῃ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιτελοῦνται θυόμενα εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἀειμνήστου καὶ πρώτης ἐκείνης τραπέζης τοῦ μυστικοῦ θείου δείπνου.*

Note 14. p. 322.

The Christian's only sacrifice the spiritual.

I give in the Essays on the Christian sacrifice the striking passages in the Fathers, from Justin Matyr and Irenæus down to St. Augustin. I cannot refrain from transcribing here the beautiful words of the "Octavius" of M. Minucius Felix, a younger contemporary of Hippolytus (ch. 32.):

"Putatis autem nos occultare quod colimus, si delubra et aras non habemus? Quod enim simulacrum Deo fingam, cum, si recte existimes, sit Dei homo ipse simulacrum? Templum quod ei exstruam, cum totus hic mundus ejus opere fabricatus cum capere non possit? et cum homo latius maneam, intra unam ædiculam vim tantæ majestatis includam? Nonne melius in nostra dedicandus est mente? in nostro immo consecrandus est pectore? Hostias et victimas Domino offeram, quas in usum mei protulit, ut rejiciam ei suum munus? ingratum est; cum sit litabilis hostia bonus animus et pura mens et sincera sententia. Igitur qui innocentiam colit, Deo supplicat; qui justitiam, Deo libat: qui fraudibus abstinet, propitiat Deum: qui hominem periculo subripit, optimam victimam cædit. Hæc nostra sacrificia, hæc Dei sacra sunt: sic apud nos religiosior est ille qui justior."

Note 15. p. 334.

The ancient Christians did not talk Christ and Christianity, but lived them.

In reading the "Octavius" over again, I find that this phrase expresses, almost verbatim, the concluding words of his peroration. He says (ch. 39.): "Nos non habitu sapientiam sed mente præferimus, *non eloquimur magna sed vivimus*, gloriamur nos consecutos quod illi (Græcorum philosophi) summa intentione quæsiverunt nec invenire potuerunt. Quid ingrati sumus? quid nobis invidemus, si veritas divinitatis nostri temporis ætate maturuit? Fruamur bono nostro, et recti sententiam temperemus, cohibeatur superstitio, impietas expietur, vera religio reservetur."

Note 16. p. 334.

THE MARTYRS DIED FOR THE LIBERTY OF MANKIND.

This is what Minucius Felix preaches in his "Apology" (ch. 36, 37.): "Sit Fortis Fortunæ (eventus): mens tamen libera est, et ideo actus hominis, non dignitas judicatur . . . . Ceterum quod plerique pauperes dicimur, non est infamia nostra, sed gloria; animus enim ut luxu solvitur, ita frugalitate firmatur. Et tamen quis potest pauper esse qui non eget, qui non inhiat alieno, qui Deo dives est? Magis pauper ille est, qui cum multa habeat, plura desiderat . . . . Igitur ut qui viam terit, eo felicior quo levior incedit, ita beatior in hoc itinere vivendi qui paupertati se sublevat, non sub divitiarum onere suspirat . . . . Ut aurum ignibus, sic nos discriminibus arguimur. Quam pulchrum spectaculum Deo, cum Christianus cum dolore congreditur! cum adversum minas et supplicia et tormenta componitur! cum strepitum mortis et horrorem carnificis arripiens inculcat! *cum libertatem suam adversus reges et principes erigit, soli Deo, cujus est, cedit!* cum triumphator et victor ipsi, qui adversus se sententiam dixit, insultat! Vicit enim qui quod contendit obtinuit . . . . Rex es? et tam times quam timeris, et quamlibet sis multo comitatu stipatus, ad periculum tamen solus es. Dives es? sed fortunæ male creditur, et magno viatico breve vitæ iter non instruitur, sed oneratur . . . . Nos igitur qui moribus et pudore censemur, merito malis voluptatibus et pompis vestris et spectaculis abstinemus, quorum et de sacris originem novimus et noxia blandimenta damnamus."

Supplementary Note.

ON THE FOREBODINGS AMONG THE CHRISTIANS OF THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES RESPECTING THE APPROACHING END OF THE WORLD AND A RENEWAL OF MANKIND AND HUMAN SOCIETY.

The highly interesting work of Commodianus, which has recently come to light in the "Spicilegium Solesmense," from the hidden treasures of Sir Thomas Phillips at Middle-Hill *, furnishes a most

* This manuscript is quite distinct from the Codex Meermanianus in the same library, which contains the "Instructiones" of Commodianus, and the existence of which was known to Oehler, their last editor.

striking example of what I have said in the above-mentioned passage about the connection of the apocalyptic views respecting the end of the world with great and appalling events of the age, reflected in the light of Christian faith and hope.

It is easy to prove that this poem must have been written between 250, the Decian persecution, and 253, the victory of Æmilianus over the Goths; and that Commodianus, the author of the "Instructiones," an African writer of the latter half of the third century, certainly composed it. According to Father Pitra the manuscript does not give the name. But this is a mistake. Sir Thomas Phillips says that it is still legible.* Its style corresponds exactly with what Gennadius

* The title of the Poem is lost in the manuscript; at the end however we find the words "Explicit tractatus Sancti Episcopi" given by the Editor. Then follow two lines, the first illegible (the name of the diocese), the second showing the letters COM.OD. . . . The "Instructiones" contain nothing which leads us to believe that Commodianus was a bishop when he wrote them: nor can I find any allusion to it in the remarkable exordium of the new text, which evidently is the remodeling of the first nine verses of the "Instructiones," and a great improvement on that rude *Prefatio:*

"Quis poterit unum proprie Deum nosse cœlorum,
Nisi ipse [1] quem is tuleret ab errore nefando?
Errabam ignarus, spatians, spe captus inani,
Dum furor ætatis primæ me portabat in auras,
Plus eram quam palea levior; quasi centum adessent
In humeris capita, sic præceps quocumque ferebar.
Non satis; his rebus criminose denique mersus
Veneficus fui factus [2], herbas incantando malignas.
Sed gratias Deo (nec sufficit vox mea tantum
Reddere), qui misere vacillanti tandem adluxit!
Aggressusque fui tradita quæ [3] in codice legis,
Quid ibi rescirem. Statim mihi lampada fulsit;
Tunc vere congovi Deum summum in altis,
Et ideo tales hortor ab errore recedant.
Quis melior medicus, nisi passus vulneris auctor?"

I would not say that these lines absolutely exclude the episcopal dignity, but the following verses (beginning of ch. iv.) certainly seem to do it:

[1] Addidi *ipse*, metri causa. P. tulerit procul.

[2] Cod.: Pene fui factus.

[3] Cod.: traditor, quod P. vult significare doctorem, eum qui tradit doctrinam.

(about the year 500) says of this original and deep African writer of provincial Latin: "Scripsit mediocri sermone, quasi versu, librum adversus paganos," and it is probably a remodeling of the first book of the "Instructiones." In this work, then, Commodianus gives a general outline of his views as to the destruction of pagan Rome. Nero is to conquer it, coming from the great river Euphrates, according to the popular belief of the time, known to us by the sibylline verses of the latter part of the first century. The beginning of woe he proclaims to be the seventh persecution (the sixth was that of Maximinus, in 239; the eighth that of Valerian, in 259; the tenth that of Aurelian, in 279); and he then prophesies that gentile Rome is to be attacked and conquered first *by the Goths*, who are to burst forth from beyond the "river." The infernal king Apolion (the Apollyon, Hebrew Abaddon, of the Apocalypse, ix. 11.) will be with them, and they will conquer Rome. This evidently is a peculiar turn he gives to the popular belief, and it may or may not be his own version. But the most interesting feature in his poem, which decidedly bears the stamp of originality, is his idea that the Germanic tribes are to be the friends and protectors of the Christians, whom they will

> "Quid Deus in primis vel qualiter singula fecit
> Jam Moses edocuit: nos autem de Christo docemus.
> Non sum ego vates, *nec doctor jussus ut essem*,
> Sed pando prædicta vatum oberrantibus austris."

All this, of course, does not exclude that the writer became a bishop afterwards, as the subscription of the MS. asserts.

At all events, I have no hesitation to assert that our work is the improvement of the first, which is that alluded to by Gennadius. The whole is entirely remodeled, and with undoubted success as to poetical value. Nor is it fettered by the unreasonable rule of continued acrostics. There are verses in it which prove that the author had studied Lucretius: others are Dantesque as to thought and style, in spite of all rhythmical barbarism. I have already observed that the beginning of both is the same: our manuscript concluded, as even D. Pitra's text shows (I have before me a much more complete deciphering of the last thirty-three verses by Sir Thomas), with the picture of the resurrection and the last judgment, which corresponds with what is called the first book of the "Instructiones," and with the first three chapters of the so-called second book. What follows (iv.—xxxviii.) is a moral exhortation to all classes of Christians. If there was a division in two books, these last twenty-five chapters constitute the second. One verse is literally the same in the two recensions, that about the Jews (Instr. xxxviii. v. 582. compared with the new text v. 228.), as the learned editor has well observed.

treat as brothers, while they show no mercy to idolatrous Rome and her pagan senate. Here at all events we have the man, not the theologian; the philosophical observer of his age, not the systematical interpreter of the Apocalypse, or of popular tradition among the Christians of old. The Goths were on the horizon of the Roman empire since their appearance in Thracia in 237. When Commodianus wrote Decius had probably only just fallen fighting against them in Mœsia, A. D. 251. It was politically a right feeling of the times, that Commodianus believed them to be in the ascendant; it was his Christian faith which made him discover in them the nation of the future. For his faith told him that moral decrepitude is an incurable evil in a nation; that as a demoralized people cannot do God's work on earth, he finds fresh tribes to do it. The pagan writers of the time see in the Goths only the scourge of the world; enemies, which, like all others, are finally to be subjugated by the power of Rome, for the Roman empire is eternal, according to their national pride and state religion. Commodianus believed in a blessed future state of the world for regenerated mankind; he believed also that this period was to be preceded by dreadful struggles and pangs. He saw bloody persecutions (one of which was approaching or only just past), and in the midst of these wars and attempts to exterminate Christianity, Commodianus beheld one of the Germanic tribes, of a nation possessing, as Tacitus had remarked almost 150 years before him, a germ of original life, based upon inner truth and mutual trust. Now in the Goths the African philosopher saw the life of the future, not simply the scourge of humanity. This was neither a politicial conjecture nor one based upon their being converts to Christianity, of which we find no trace among them in the time of Commodianus, nor down to the beginning of the fourth century. Unless we suppose this to have been an accidental good hit, we must allow that Commodianus had an intuitive perception of what can or cannot produce new life to the development of the kingdom of God. This is not attributing to him a miraculous prophetical gift; there is no reason why any true Christian philosopher should not discover in the conflicting elements of disturbed and convulsed times what is to last and what is to perish. Commodianus believed that the Roman and Greek nations were doomed to perish, because they were deeply demoralized; and that the age predicted by Christ, and beheld in vision by one of his disciples, was to come after all those struggles, and be brought on by a barbarous but honest race.

Apollyon is the king of perdition of the Apocalypse; he is not

called the king of the Goths, but he accompanies them as the avenger when they pass the Danube in arms. Now it is certainly a historical fact that 150 years later a Gothic king conquered Rome, and that the Goths became with other tribes the chosen instrument of world-renewing Christianity. And, moreover, the old world has perished indeed; the new one is come in reality, on this very globe, in this very age of the world in which we live.

We now give the text of this interesting chapter with a few corrections, which seem necessary and warranted. The versification is barbarous, though not without rhythmical laws. The preceding chapter predicts the kingdom of God in the year of the world 6000, therefore, like Hippolytus, about 500 A. D. Mankind then will be blessed in God:

> "Tunc homo resurget solis in agone reductus,
> Et gaudet in Deo, reminiscens quid fuit ante . . .
> Nec erit anxietas ulla, nisi gaudia semper;
> Quisque tribus credit et sentit unum adesse,
> Hic erit perpetuus in æterna sæcla renatus."

These are the concluding words of chapter xxxvi.: what follows constitutes chapter xxxvii.:

> "Sed quidam, hæc, aiunt, quando hæc ventura putamus?
> Accipite paucis, quibus actis illa sequentur.
> Multa quidem signa fient teterrimæ pestis,*
> Sed erit initium septima persecutio nostra.
> Ecce januam † pulsat et jam cognoscitur ense,‡
> Qui cito trajiciet §, Gothis inrumpentibus, amnem.
> Rex Apolion erit cum ipsis nomine dirus,
> Qui persecutionem dissipet sanctorum in armis.
> Pergit ad Romam cum multa millia gentis ‖
> Decretoque Dei captivat ex parte subactos.
> Multi senatorum tunc enim captavi deflebunt,
> Et Deum cœlorum blasphemant a barbaro victi.

* Cod.: fieri tantæ termini pesti. Pitra corrigit: tantum *fient*.

† Janua pulsat. P. pulsatur.

‡ Et cogitur esse. P. (cum Dübnero ut apparet): cogitatur adesse.

§ Quæ cito trajeci. Et. — Pitra hæc ita in addendis corrigenda proponit (p. 542.): "Nescio an cuiquam placuerit: En januam pulsat et cogitatur adesse. Nemini vero non probabitur necessaria correctio: Quæ cito trajiciet," etc.

‖ Gentes. Præpositio *cum* a Commodiano etiam alio loco cum accusativo casu construitur.

Ili tamen gentiles pascunt Christianos ubique,
Quos magis ut fratres requirunt gaudio pleni.
Nam luxuriosos et idola vana * colentes
Persequuntur enim et senatum sub jugo mittunt.
Hæc mala percipiunt qui sunt persecuti dilectos,
Mensibus in quinque trucidantur isti † sub hoste.
Exsurgit interea sub ipso tempore Cyrus,
Qui terreat hostes et liberat inde senatum.
Ex infero redit, qui fuerat regno præreptus ‡
Et diu servatus cum pristino corpore notus.
Discimus § hunc autem Neronem esse vetustum,
Qui Petrum et Paulum prius punivit in urbe;
Ipse redit iterum sub ipso sæculi fine
Ex locis apocryphis, qui fuit reservatus in ista.
Hunc ipsis notum ‖ invisum esse mirantur,
Qui cum apparuerit, quasi deum esse putabunt.

* Varia. † Istâ. ‡ Præceptus.
§ Dicimus. ‖ Ipse natus.

APPENDIX.

ESSAYS

ON

THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE AND WORSHIP

AND ON

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE CONSCIOUSNESS AND LIFE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH RESPECTING THE SACRIFICE AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL LAW AND GOVERNMENT.

The consciousness of the ancient Church rested upon the faith in the Father, the only God, Creator, and Ruler of the Universe; in the Son, the Eternal Word manifested and incarnate in Christ; and in the Spirit, uniting and directing the faithful into all truth. The ancient Christians, believing in the evidence of those who had seen the incarnate Word, and were sent by him into the world, felt themselves, as members of the body of the faithful, to be a spiritual community, consecrated in truth to the Father through the Son. But as soon as Jerusalem and the Temple were destroyed, this belief and this inward feeling prompted the Christians to consider themselves as those to whom the future of the world was given, and to act accordingly. The second destruction of Jerusalem and of Judaism by Hadrian strengthened this feeling of their having a mission to perform on this earth, and confirmed in them that world-renewing tendency. But their position was unprecedented. They were to form a religious body, and they had no Law; for the Law of the Mosaic dispensation had been fulfilled, and was now extinct. The decalogue itself remained only as a moral code, and that in the sense of the sublime spiritual summary given in Deuteronomy, and sanctioned by Christ: Love to God and to the brother Man. They were to realize the divine Temple-worship, and they had no visible God and no ritual: for their God was within them, and they were themselves Sanctuary, Priests, and Sacrifice. They were to reorganize the world by the principle and example of self-government, but they had themselves no form of government; for they were to manifest self-government based upon self-control within and extinction of the selfish will.

These three negations made their cause appear to unbelievers, Jews and Gentiles, desperate and contemptible, and themselves godless men and atheists: but, in the mind of God, these negations, no less than those corresponding affirmations, were the pledge of their vitality and of the truth of their cause. The future of the world was by both given to them who had in themselves eternal life. The history of the world bears evidence that their faith was true, and that they fulfilled the divine decree.

The ancient Christians had no Law binding upon them except that of conscience. But they believed that God had revealed himself to Abraham, and afterwards through Moses and the Prophets, to the Jewish people, and that the Jewish Scriptures spoke of Christ. Christ in the Scriptures, that is to say, in the Old Testament, was to them what God in nature is to the mind contemplating the universe. But the Spirit, which was working in them, gave them in the course of the first century, or in the first two generations after Christ, the Scriptures of the New Covenant. During this epoch the consciousness of the faithful was principally directed to Christ, as to Him who was to come again, in order to make an end of the wickedness and godlessness of the world.

But since the destruction of Jerusalem, the downfall of the Temple of the Almighty, and the extinction of the Sacrifice and Worship of the Sanctuary, the Christians gradually understood that they were to continue Christ's work of love, self-devotion, and regenerating wisdom and holiness upon the earth as it is, and in the world as it was then constituted. From this time the Spirit within them directed their consciousness more and more towards the work now to be done, a work respecting which the Apostolic writings, most providentially, contained no precept. It was by the agency of that same Spirit, which had made Histories the sacred records of the New Covenant between God and man, that the Church, that is to say, redeemed humanity, became conscious of her position as to the two fundamental branches of her life.

The one is that which directs itself immediately to God, the intercommunion of worshipping believers with God in Spirit and

Truth. This is the manifestation of divine life, as thankfulness and love, through prayer. Prayer is both the consecration of Self to God, and the appropriation of divine life, and this act is by its own nature one that has its root in the universal consciousness implanted in man. For it is performed by the believer, not as an individual act, but in his capacity of a member of the believing community, of believing humanity. In this element of religious life originated Christian worship, the germs of which, though only spiritually, were planted by Christ; first, by the Lord's prayer and His speeches recorded in St. John's Gospel; subsequently, by his dying command to remember and announce his death at every common meal. But all these elements crystallized and coalesced in Christian worship only by the free impulse of the Spirit in the Church.

The other branch of the life of the Church is directed towards God through the world. This is the sacrifice of Self in the ordinary life of man, that is to say, in the relations of the Christian to his brethren and to the world without. Upon this point again, no law was prescribed to the Christians. But the command to love their brethren as themselves, to consider every man as their neighbour, and to live in the world as children of one Father, made men the temple of God. These were the germs which, in the midst of the bloodiest military despotism, and the deepest prostration of national life, became through the Spirit the origin of all liberty, self-government, and order, which now exist in the world and, humanly speaking, regulate its destinies.

The fundamental idea of the formation of Christian discipline and government is, the existence of a Christian people, a community capable of boundless expansion, but which is represented by two or three gathered together in Christ's name in every local congregation. In this community, and therefore at a later stage of its evolution in their synodic representation, resides the Spirit, and it possesses therefore the right of ultimate decision in all matters connected with the common Christian order.

The object of such ordinances, however, was to regulate the life and conduct of individual believers, not by externally binding laws, but by the power of conscience. In this manner customs

were formed on the basis of Christ's precepts, and the occasional advice and decisions of the Apostles, which still were directly enjoined, according as the exigency of the moment required, through the Spirit in the Church, *i. e.* the Believers.

The community celebrated common meals, or love feasts, as a bond of mutual brotherhood between rich and poor, great and small; on which occasions they made thankful remembrance of the death of Christ, and prayed for the coming of his kingdom in conformity with his dying injunctions.

In imitation of the Jewish institution, the bread and wine were administered by the Elders, who had originally been appointed by the Apostles, or their missionaries. According to credible evidence, this office was subsequently declared by the Apostles, with common consent, an office for life, unless an Elder should become, in the judgment of the congregation, incapable or unworthy of performing it. These, then, were the Elders who in the common meals administered bread and wine and prayer, and took care of the poor, supported by the Ministrants or Deacons. They also presided in all the common Christian acts of the faithful, whether in preaching or in administering the substance of the Church, and decided ordinary cases of dispute, the ultimate jurisdiction being vested in the whole congregation, the Elders of course included. St. John established, or sanctioned the institution of single Rectors, called Overseers, which is the meaning of the word Bishops, as presidents of the presbytery. This form of government, as being the more perfect and practical, particularly in such difficult times, soon spread over the Christian world.

From these beginnings sprang that state of worship, discipline, and government, which, with great varieties, but in wonderful harmony, ruled the Christian world in the fifth, sixth, and seventh generations, or in the ages of Irenæus of Lugdunum, Clemens of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and Origen.

The Canon of the New Testament was settled in the leading Churches, with some slight differences which disturbed nobody.

As to the common Christian worship, the synagogue had been its prototype in the first ages: afterwards the service of

the Temple had been realized in spirit and truth by the Christian congregation becoming conscious of being the true Temple, and their heart the true Sanctuary, hallowed by the death and remembrance of Christ. The sacrifice of thanksgiving was invariably connected with the celebration of the Communion, no meeting for worship taking place without the faithful partaking of it. Thus the celebration of the thankful self-sacrifice of the Church was based upon the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and sealed by its solemn remembrance.

Some few formularies had come into general use on these occasions. The Lord's Prayer, with the Doxology added to it liturgically by the Christian Church, was the first. Next came the hymn of antiphonic praise and prayer, called the Morning Hymn, which had its origin in a still more ancient one, of which the words were borrowed from St. Luke's Gospel, the utterance of the exulting sympathy of the invisible world with the birth of Christ. That hymn (preserved in its more ancient form in the Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament, to the canonical books of which it is appended) afterwards became the origin of the Litany, which is nothing but an amplification of its middle part. Then the antiphonic exhortation, "Sursum corda," ushered in the sacrificial service: but the prayer of the Eucharist itself (literally, of the Thanksgiving) had sprung out of the Jewish custom of prayer, by which the father of the family blessed the bread and the cup of wine. Its wording was left to the inspiration or learning of the officiating Elder, who might content himself with praying the Lord's Prayer, followed by the Doxology. There may have been some formularies written down for the private use of the weak and ignorant; but even this is doubtful. The idea of reading prayers seems to have been particularly repugnant to the ancient Church at this solemn time.

Lastly, the life of the Church in the world was guided, on the basis of the words of Christ and the injunctions of the Apostles, by certain rules and practices, which had gradually been formed in the different Churches. They were, on the whole, justly considered Apostolical, particularly in the most ancient Churches. Most likely they were here and there consigned to writing at

an early date, and either collected in the form of precepts or rules, called in a later age Canons, or in the form of mere homiletic addresses. But there was no authentic collection either of Canons, or of Injunctions or Constitutions, much less were there decrees and canons of Synods, or Councils, to that effect.

The rules and customs respecting Baptism partook both of the liturgical and the constitutional character. There were, first, rules respecting the preliminary reception of a catechumen, as a pupil to be admitted to instruction. Then (generally after three years) came the solemn moment when the catechumen was to profess, with certain forms, his faith before the congregation, and pledge himself most solemnly, in the face of God, to be faithful to his profession of Christianity, in word and life, unto death: upon which declaration he was immersed in water in the name of the Father (God), the Son (Jesus the Christ), and the Spirit (the life-giver of the Church).

The idea of a collateral view of baptism and communion, as the two sacraments, and of a doctrine of the sacraments on the ground of that juxtaposition, was (as has been already intimated) entirely unknown to the ancient Church.

It is impossible not to see in this whole development the special manifestation of the Divine Spirit, directed towards making the organization and life of the Christian association the regenerating element of human society in ages to come. For, according to the course of development which we observe in other religious societies, our sacred books would now be, not the Histories of Christ and his disciples, but a Liturgy as Ritual, and a Canonical Digest as Law, as a Constitution. Mohammedanism has made both out of the Koran, which itself is already strongly impregnated with ritual and constitutional tendencies and elements. Even the Jewish development shows something essentially analogous, if we consider how, out of Abrahamitic rites, and the ethical laws, which we call the Ten Commandments, a new religious code was formed, which made the nation first rebellious and then formalistic.

A century after Hippolytus Christianity began to become the religion of the empire, a process which was completed in another

century. About that time, towards the middle of the fifth century, the Ritual was completely formularized as far as the communion service was concerned, partly out of really old and venerable materials, partly out of spurious and hybrid liturgical compositions bearing the names of Apostles. But collections of traditional Apostolic, or at least very ancient, customs and ordinances had been made first, before the time of Irenæus and Hippolytus, at all events about the middle of the second century, under the fictitious names of "Doctrine," or "Constitution," of the Apostles. The disciples of Christ were supposed to have dictated them to their disciple, Clemens of Rome, who at an early stage became the mythical defender of the episcopal principle and hierarchical order, and at the same time the representative of the more Judaic or Petrine view of Christian doctrine and life. About 150 years later, Hippolytus, by his treatise on "The Apostolic Traditions respecting the Charismata, or Gifts of the Spirit," (a sort of philosophy of the primitive traditional ceremonial Customs and Regulations), exercised, as we shall show, an influence upon the composition of a part of the Apostolic Constitutions, namely, the section upon "The Offices of the Church, and some of the rites connected with the performance of them in the Christian worship."

The following Fragments are destined to illustrate, and, as far as is necessary, to establish by new researches, such points respecting the view here taken of the history of the ancient Church, as appear either not to have been already sufficiently cleared up in general, or which receive a new light by the restoration of Hippolytus as an influential man in the second and third centuries, and the organ of communication between the East and the West.

The immortal work of Neander, "The History of the Church," and his special books on the Apostolic Age, on the Gnostics, and on Tertullian, may be considered as the general critical basis upon which our inquiry takes its stand: but there

is scarcely a single point which is not illustrated by other researches of the historical German school. Gieseler's and Niedner's truly learned "Handbooks of Ecclesiastical History" deserve here a special mention.

Since the years 1822 and 1829, when I wrote my "Essays on the Liturgical Life of the Church," Höfling has published some instructive and accurate monographies on the history and philosophy of the Christian Sacrifice, according to Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clemens of Alexandria, which fully confirm what I said in my theses on that subject. I limited myself to a short documentary exposition of the views of Irenæus on the Christian Sacrifice and the Eucharist.

The weakest point of German criticism is the origin and gradual formation of the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons. Krabbe's and Drey's researches (1829 and 1832) have certainly refuted many of the uncritical and unhistorical ideas of Beveridge on this subject (corrected also, as to the Canon Law, by Eichhorn, in his Handbook*): but the positive solution of the problem is little advanced by those writers. The publication of the Coptic text of the "Apostolical Constitutions," by Tattam (1849), combined with the researches on Hippolytus in the first volume of this work, may, I hope, furnish the key to such a solution. I have collated the Coptic text with Ludolf's translations of a part of the corresponding Ethiopic version. The Arabic version of another Alexandrian collection, preserved in the Ethiopic Church, and known by the name of the Canons of Hippolytus, is of no less importance. Of this collection nothing has hitherto been known beyond the titles of the chapters. The text I owe principally to the kindness of my learned friend, the Rev. W. Cureton, to whom I am also indebted for that of the Apostolical Constitutions according to the Church of Antioch, preserved in Syriac, and contained among the treasures rescued from the Libyan desert, but not yet published.

* Grundsätze des Kirchenrechts, 1831, vol. i.

FIRST SECTION.

ESSAYS ON THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE AND WORSHIP.

I.

THESES ON THE EUCHARIST WHICH CAN BE PROVED HISTORICALLY.

(Translated from the German original, written in Dec. 1822.)

It is on the authority of the words of Christ as recorded by St. John, and the doctrine of St. Paul, that the ancient Church, with a different arrangement of the separate parts, has viewed the Communion under very different forms and terms, and as the highest act of the Christian Church, on the faithful performance of which a peculiar blessing is believed to rest. In the other parts of the service the faithful glorify Christ, and pray and thank God *through* him as the Mediator: but in the Communion they worship God *with* Christ, as Christ's brethren, and as being one with him, *just as Christ worshipped his Father.* This view explains, for instance, the difficult 23rd canon of the Third Carthaginian Council: "Ut nemo in precibus patrem pro filio, vel filium pro patre, nominet. *Et quum altari adsistitur, semper ad patrem dirigatur oratio.*" Cf. Bingh. v. p. 66 sqq.; Basnage, Annal. ad an. 397, iii. p. 159.

2.

The different parts necessarily combined in this celebration, are:

1) The facts of the redemption, and especially that of the propitiatory death of Christ, being the fulfilment of the Law, the true sense of the Jewish rites, the essential truth in the shadows of the heathen sacrifices.

2) The idea that by the internal working of the wills of the whole body of believers, the power of the propitiatory death of Christ is individually renewed to the end of the world.

3) The union between the HISTORICAL fact, which is of universal efficacy and was accomplished once for all, and the SPIRITUAL AND INDIVIDUAL FACT, which in the succession of generations, nations, and times forms the spiritual body of Christ: a union which rests on the foundation of the faith in a Church, and her duration until the second

coming of Christ; and which the Church having perceived by the reflecting power of the mind feels the want of expressing liturgically.

3.

Every dogmatical exposition of this idea, and of the connection between its different parts, is one-sided, and is reduced to a secondary value so soon as the realization of the inward life in the act of worship operates vigorously upon the mind.

4.

The controversies between the two Protestant Churches (the Lutheran and Calvinistic) not only did not touch this highest view, but started from an *equal acknowledgment* of its truth.

5.

The real point at issue with the Roman Church does not consist in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which forms a part of that dogmatic development of the past, which is to be reduced to its proper, that is to say, a secondary, value.

6.

The real fundamental corruption of the Roman Church, and at the same time her whole power, rather in the heathenish turn she has given to the liturgically expressed consciousness of the ancient Church about her *sacrifice*, and the consequent change of centre of the sacrificial action in the celebration of the Communion.

7.

The fundamental parts of all the old Masses are *Eucharistia* and *Communio*. The divisions of the first are:

Laudes, General praise for God's benefits, in relation to redemption and sanctification.

Preces, General prayer, of the faithful, intercession or supplication for all mankind.

Commemoratio, Declaration of the death of Christ, and of his commandment always to commemorate the same.

8.

The divisions of the *Communio* are:

Consecratio, Prayer for blessing the visible tokens (elementa), for blessing those who receive them, and all who are in the communion of the Church, together with their relations, dead as well as living (in this respect nearly coinciding with the *Preces*).

Communio, The partaking of the Supper *by all* the faithful.

Oblatio, The spiritual offering of the faithful, of their wishes and hopes, and their whole Being; a part easily confounded with the offering of the *dona, munera, elementa,* in the offertory BEFORE the Communio.

9.

If we would express the view of the old Church, as it can even now be liturgically traced, exactly as the Roman Church would be obliged to express it, if (which *is a question of discipline*) she would retain the existing celebration of Mass, divesting it of all that is false, we might do so somewhat in the following manner:

Mankind *in abstracto* or *potentialiter*, is reconciled with God through the historical fact of Christ's propitiatory death, which was only foreshadowed, not realized, by all the former sacrifices and expiations. But the operation of the Holy Ghost is necessary to make the individual, *actualiter*, participate in this reconciliation. This operation shows itself most perfectly and in a particularly blessed manner, which cannot be compensated for by anything else, in the act by which all who partake of the Lord's Supper are incorporated with Christ by the Communion, according to the Commandments of Christ. All those who worthily receive this Communion are most intimately united with Christ, and through him with God and with all good spirits; and for them this *act* of the Communion is as decisive an act in the kingdom of God on earth (that is to say, in the Church), as the act of regeneration in baptism (that is to say, of the primitive baptism, or such a baptism of children as is completed by confirmation) is for the faithful *individual*. So far as any one of those who partake of the Supper becomes a living part of Christ's body, he enters into the union. For those who are united through Christ's body and blood are divested of their Self, by which, although they are regenerated, they were separated from God and the faithful people. They receive, therefore, in the highest degree, the divine power to offer to God the spiritual sacrifice of themselves, resigning their own will to that of God, in order to be delivered from all their sins, and to advance the kingdom of God. This offering and spiritual sacrifice is just as agreeable to God, with regard to the partakers of the Supper, as Christ's death and visible offering of himself were agreeable to him with regard to all mankind; whereas, without this union and incorporation into Christ, such a work would have been not only useless, but also rash and condemnatory. But as *all* the faithful in Christ are intimately united by the celebration of the

Supper, each partial union of them must be an *appropriation*, and consequently a spiritual *reproduction*, of the propitiatory death, a general efficacious and valid *act* in the spiritual world, a general advancement of the kingdom of God. In this action, therefore, consists the true union of all the faithful, whether living or dead, whether members of the Church militant or triumphant.

The view of the Reformers in not giving prominence to this idea *in the celebration* of the Supper, was correct as a point of discipline; for the Papistical abuses were so closely bound up with it as to be inseparable, the idea of sacrifice itself having such an indelible power over the mind. There is an analogy in the Mosaic legislation with regard to the doctrine of immortality, the belief in which was united with the worship of the dead amongst the heathen and inseparable from polytheism.

10.

The faith in a Church rests on a union of religious feelings and experience with one or more historical elements which form the objective foundation. For through this union alone the historical part can be understood as a *revelation;* that is, not as a passing apparition, but as an immediate operation of divine intelligence, and as a permanently operating, living, divine power, and therefore as the totality of the different elements of the individual life. It is an undoubted fact, although it may be difficult of explanation, that such a belief may rest for centuries on a basis historically false. In like manner, *vice versâ*, a Church, in which a true historical foundation has been preserved, may decay and die, and must do so necessarily, without any violent catastrophe, so soon as that connection is denied *in principle*, that is to say, so soon as all living religion is rejected, or has become unintelligible. But in historical times a Church is lost irretrievably, as soon as an inward religious life awakes, and such a connection has become impossible for the really prominent religious minds of the time, for intelligent and conscientious men. Such a Church, nevertheless, may support herself, *for some time*, through the good and evil disposition of human nature, through respect and inertness, until another ground of faith be shown to the inward religious experience. This other ground must exhibit itself as the true one, by proving itself to be not something lower and negative, but something higher and positive, and by establishing itself as fact, by the proof of the inward power. That this is possible in the development of the Christian Church, is evinced above all by the divine power of the Gospel: the faith, that it *will* happen, is the real *faith in the Church*.

II.

THE EPOCHS OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE AND THE EUCHARIST.

(Translated from the German original, written in Feb. 1823.)

No one of the four ecclesiastical *doctrines* is immediately connected with the words of Christ or Apostolic usage.

*

No one of them exhausts, as a doctrine, either the words of Christ or the practice of the Apostles.

*

In Christ's words is found what was destined to render the celebration of the Supper the groundwork of Christian communion and divine service, and what distinguished its development from that of all the other bonds of communion and parts of worship — from baptism and prayer.

*

In Christ's words is found the connection between the fact of his propitiatory death with bread and wine, and the partaking of them, as a new covenant, as a commemoration, and (in reference to what is said by St. John) as the highest divine blessing for life eternal.

*

The connection thus founded cannot be exhausted either by moral application or by dogmatical argumentation.

*

The institution of the Communion received its perfect meaning and fulfilment through Christ's death, and the pouring out of the Holy Ghost upon the Disciples.

*

From that time the meaning of the celebration was necessarily understood by the mind *in the same degree* as the Christian worship separated itself from the Judaic, and in the same manner *as the Christian community became conscious of its peculiar position.*

*

Undoubtedly the Supper was in the beginning considered as a part of Christ's Institution, and for this reason the preparatory act of bringing bread and wine, and even other food, to the table, was viewed as a sacred act, being an imitation of Christ's thanksgiving and blessing (*εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας*). It is evident from 1 Cor. xii., that, when St. Paul wrote that Epistle, the Eucharist was celebrated *after* the meal. Did this celebration take place at the morning meeting ? and, if so, did it take place before a meal or altogether without a meal ? It is *possible* that the Apostles changed the original union of meal and Communion, on account of the disorder to which it had given rise.

*

Between this and the next tradition the separation of Christian and Jewish worship took place. Together with or before it, the idea of Christ being the High Priest, and his death being the fulfilment of the Jewish expiatory sacrifice, had perfectly developed itself into a spiritualization of the notions of altar and sanctuary. The Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 10.), addressed perhaps to Alexandria, evinces already an almost dogmatical consciousness of this idea.

*

Pliny's account exhibits to us the Communion as separate from the Agape, or at least as being celebrated before it (with an interval): " Morem fuisse rursus coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium."

*

In Justin Martyr, the offering of the bread and wine that were to be blessed, and the offering of alms that were to be distributed among the indigent (*δῶρα, ἀκροθίνια*, Const. App.), are expressed by the same word (*προσφέρειν*). It is said of the latter, *προσφέρεται τῷ πρωεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν* (i. 85.), for prayer and thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστία*). But by the same word bread and wine are denoted (*καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία*). In this expression three different series of ideas are involved which may be multifariously developed. *Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστεῖσαν τροφὴν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι.* The three ideas combined here may be expressed in the following propositions :

Christ was invested with flesh and blood through the Word of God:
Bread and wine become Christ's body and blood through the word of Christ:
The *partakers* of the Supper become spiritual members of Christ through the Communion.

Justin does not speak expressly of the common meal, which may be explained by the circumstance of his mentioning the *oblatio* of food in opposition to the partaking of bread and wine (*ἐπὶ πᾶσί τε οἷς προσφερόμεθα* (what we feed upon) *εὐλογοῦμεν*, κ.τ.λ. ib. 87.).

Tertullian's *cœna* is the Love-feast (agape) at nightfall. He speaks of the communion as Justin does; and even in his time it was the custom of the African Church to take it fasting, which proves that the meal and Communion had been separated. Cyprian, however, did not condemn the most ancient custom, which in the African Church itself was observed on Holy Thursday. The oblation of the *primitiæ* remained, however, as an introductory part.

*

The fact of none of the older Fathers of the Church recognizing the custom of the Love-feast *before* the Communion, and of their general admission of its celebration *after* the Communion to be the oldest Apostolical custom, is a proof that the change took place at an early period. Meals in the Church, without the Communion, were however still celebrated in the fourth century, and in some places even down to the seventh, as is proved by the prohibition in the Councils of Laodicea and Tours.

*

There is an unquestionable harmony in the development of the celebration and of the fundamental view of the Lord's Supper in the several principal Churches, which becomes more evident, when the individual difference is acknowledged and asserted. The existence of this harmony obliges us to admit two facts. First: Special Apostolical institutions and injunctions (as is also admitted by Schleiermacher) — secondly: Perpetual operation of the Spirit in the Church. The historical and spiritual factors act in this development in a manner analogous to the relation of both in the formation of language.

*

In the Fathers of the third and fourth centuries we find the *εὐχαριστία* already developed in the twofold signification contained in the words of the Institution: real thanksgivings for God's benefits and prayer for blessing (*εὐλογεῖν, ἁγιάζειν* is used instead of *εὐλογεῖν* in the Greek Mass of the Const. App. in the words of the consecration, *sanctificare*). The two prayers together therefore form the whole

προσφορά: both are developed from the consciousness of the Church being the *community of the faithful.* The εὐλογία begins with the invocation of the Holy Ghost to bless the partakers of the Supper and the token of their sacramental prayer, the so-called *elementa*, generally in a reversed order, the universal prayer for the Christian Church coming after the prayer for blessing the partakers. But this most solemn prayer is always based upon the promise and the prayer of Christ in the Institution: the words of the Institution are therefore always read at the beginning of the prayers of consecration.

*

In how different a manner this idea developed itself is especially evident from the Petavian Codex or the Visigothic missal (now Bibl. Christina, cod. 626.) of the eighth or ninth century, which was edited by Thomasius. In this missal, the reading of the words of Institution follows the collect after the Sanctus, with which all the Churches concluded their prayer of thanksgiving. The precatory part of the offertory, in all the other Latin Masses (which all are derived from the Roman), stands in part between the "Sanctus" and "Qui pridie" as the conclusion of the "sacrificium laudis," and in part afterwards as "preces sanctificationis."

*

The Sacrifice, denoted by the *oblatio*, is called in all passages, not only of the Fathers, but also of the Roman canon, *sacrificium laudis.*

*

But we find the *prayer, the act of oblatio, and the sacrifice* very early identified, even before the *oblatio* of the congregation began to be an antiquated custom. The connection of the ideas, by which the token of thanks and of the prayers of the faithful was considered as being to them the token of the body and blood of Christ, upon which the certainty of their being heard was based, would naturally be more or less prominent.

*

But in whatever way we may combine the three points, the historical element, or the fact of the revelation of Christ's death and his Institution; the signs of communion with him, as well as of the prayer of the faithful; and the *inward act* of regeneration and union with God in the dividual; we can never, from this point of view, arrive at the doctrine established by the Council of Trent; that the *consecratio hostiæ* was to be a repetition of the propitiatory death of Christ, a sacrifice, and even the perpetual sacrifice of the Church.

*

All the Fathers, when speaking of the mystical part of the Lord's Supper, always do so with special reference to the *communion*, as the fulfilment of the act, and their feeling rests in the consciousness of the Church, that is to say, of the communion of the faithful, as being the body of Christ, Christ's brethren, children of God through the Holy Ghost.

*

If it be granted that this *communio* exists in its fullest sense (that is to say, in conformity with the expressions of the third article in the creed), and that it was sealed originally and essentially by Christ himself consecrating his Supper, and instituting the Church in the communion (as partaking of his body and blood), and that it is continually renewed in the succession of generations, it is necessary to grant also; first, that the whole development of the celebration of the Lord's Supper *on the basis of the consciousness of the Church* was purely evangelical, although not literally contained in the Gospel; and secondly, that this development was necessarily connected with the historical evolution and modification of this consciousness, so that both would degenerate and disappear together.

*

It does not at all follow from this, that even the most perfect form of the ancient Church is capable of being maintained *unchanged.*

On the contrary, if we consider it well, this is impossible from its very nature. For in every individual or common expression of the consciousness of a given time, three things, the idea, the organ of expression, and the external form (the crust, without which no life is isolated from the external world), are intimately, and for this stage of development inseparably, joined together, according to the eternal laws of human existence. Whatever appears as crust during the formation becomes dross after the decay; lifeless but indestructible.

*

Viewed from the centre of that consciousness, the doctrine of Transubstantiation lies on quite a different field; the very question even cannot be started from that centre.

*

Neither can such an opposition to that doctrine, as tends towards a doctrine connected in one way or another with the same question.

*

The rite of the communion cannot be expressed by any dogmatical exposition on this subject, even were such an exposition offered simply as an explanation of the consciousness of the mind of the worshipper.

*

The point from which Calvin starts in his "Institutions" is undoubtedly very convenient for understanding historically the development of the celebration of the Communion, with a view to refute the Roman doctrine, and to establish a pure exposition upon the basis of the Gospel and Apostolic custom. But in order to arrive at a conclusion, and to oppose the systems of Rome, Luther, and Zwingli, he afterwards abandons that idea and throws himself into the field of controversy.

*

The depth of Luther's theology consisted in the consciousness of the Christian life in God through the union with Christ, which delivers us from the bonds of our individual existence (liberi arbitrii), and removes us into the liberty of the Divine will. He rejected, therefore, every doctrine of the communion that led him away from it, or appeared to endanger this consciousness. This view manifests itself not so much in his dogmatical writings as in his sermons (chiefly those of 1518), and a comparison of them with the deepest of all theological works, the "German Theology." It was, perhaps, the powerful influence of St. Augustin, that prevented Luther from developing his doctrine as it appears there; for St. Augustin uses *also* other expressions with which the system of ideas, subsequently sanctioned by the Church, might more easily be connected.

*

The associations of ideas, created by the earliest ecclesiastical custom, were very early treated mystically; the token of the ecclesiastical thanksgiving being, at the same time, the image and token of the great universal propitiatory sacrifice. But no original Christian consciousness can rest on such a juxtaposition, which is merely external, although it ought to be treated with respect.

*

Neither can the subject be thoroughly understood by merely considering the Communion as the summit and end of the whole celebration, if we continue to consider the taking of the sacrament as the pledge and means of individual absolution and justification. The act of justification of the individual corresponds with the inner regeneration, and its sacrament is baptism in the ancient sense, as the confirmation of the Christian instruction. To him who is thus regenerated the Church gives absolution: and it is a wholly unfounded supposition of many modern authors, that the absolution belongs to the Communion, and the Communion to the absolution. By endeavouring in this manner to explain the Communion ethically

but entirely individually, we lose the notion of the Communion. But he only who is regenerated, and has been absolved after confessing his sinfulness, may come to the Communion without condemnation.

*

The connection of the ideas of the ancient Church about the Communion seems, on the contrary, reducible, in the simplest manner, to the following views.

The most general signification of *adoration* is the inward act of the consciousness of our dependence upon, and our separation from, God. This being understood as *word* is prayer, as *action* sacrifice; or, each word spoken in that consciousness is prayer, each action performed in that consciousness is sacrifice. The prayer itself, as manifesting itself externally in speech, is sacrifice.

Each sacrifice expresses a prayer.

That *consciousness*, whether in prayer or in sacrifice, manifests itself:

either as acknowledgment of our guilt, separation, and want of propitiation — *confession, expiatory sacrifice;*

or as acknowledgment of our nothingness (dependence) and offering of our thanks — *thanksgiving, thanksoffering.*

The *prayer* for something definite may be connected with both kinds, but presupposes always the one or the other. Word and action are only *tokens* of that inward consciousness, and are multifariously connected with each other. Both are equally original tokens. The most natural realization, however, is under the form of the action, in opposition to the word, because the inward consciousness itself appears as an act of our inward life, as the active manifestation, and, as it were, its pulsation. That is, therefore, the fundamental notion of the sacrifice, in which that inward act exhibits itself more strikingly to man. The subject and the object of the sacrifice (the offering and the offered) are therefore identical in the real sacrifice; viz. they are united in man. All sacrifices of Judaism and heathenism (*legis et naturæ*) are symbols of this sacrifice, which is primitive, founded upon the nature of man, and consequently a token and indication of *self-sacrifice.* The awful aberration of the human mind respecting human sacrifices explains itself as a consequence of that idea having seized, with all its power, upon a great and strong mind, confounded by superstition, savageness, or great crimes.

All sacrifices of natural religion and of the law, being symbolical with regard to the inward act of individual life, are figurative with

regard to the great historical centre of the universal life of mankind, viz. Christ.

The sacrifices of the law are figurative in an *eminent* sense; at first on account of the historical connection with the historical fulfilment of their manifestation; and, secondly, because the monotheism of the Law kept the fundamental notions together, whereas the polytheism of the natural religions scattered them by connecting the sacrificial act with the variety of natural existence, and of the special symbolism which sprung from that variety.

The details in the sacrifices of the Law, and in the great propitiatory sacrifice, are only so far to be accepted figuratively, as Christ made them so by his application to himself; an idea applicable to the figurative sense in the Messianic prophecies.

Christ's life was a perfect inward sacrifice through his obedience, and by his surrendering his will to the will of God: his death was the seal and culminating point of this active and passive obedience as the accomplishment of the Divine decrees. (See on this topic the "German Theology.") Christ, according to his own declarations after the resurrection, according to his own words before his death, recorded in the Gospel of St. John, according to the doctrine of St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, and according to the Epistle to the Hebrews (making every allowance for Jewish ideas as to the expressions and historical development of the argument), is essentially and really, and therefore perpetually until the end of the world, the High Priest of the faithful, as he has been the great propitiatory sacrifice during his earthly existence. But as High Priest he is the mediator of the prayer of the faithful. The prayer of the faithful becomes, through him and his office as High Priest, a sacrifice in its real sense. The faithful are called to be living sacrifices; just as it is said to them: "Pray without ceasing." (Rom. xii. 1.; 1 Thess. v. 17.)

The foundation and fundamental idea of every Christian worship as such, in opposition both to the deistic worship and to the Jewish and Pagan, is therefore Christ's sacrifice, consummated by his surrendering his life to the will of the Father.

First: Christ's sacrifice is the foundation of our prayer for the absolution of sins (confession), being the propitiatory sacrifice for all men and for all times, and as such also of all *prayers*.

Secondly: Christ's sacrifice is the central point of our thanksgivings, all thanks and praise to God tending towards the thanksgivings for the redemption in Christ. As far as all the faithful are called to thank, this thanksgiving is a real offering of thanks.

Thirdly: Christ's sacrifice is the basis of the consciousness of our life in God, if that consciousness becomes adoration. This requires further explanation.

The fact, by which we participate in the redemption as instituted by Christ's death, by which it becomes real for us, is called Justification with regard to God's decree, Regeneration with regard to men. We have here only to consider the individual side of this spiritual fact. It shows itself as individual life becoming conscious of the divine life. But the individual conscience of man acknowledges besides and above the unity of the individual, a higher unity in mankind, which may be understood as tribe or nation, or altogether universal. The consummation of that process of growing consciousness consists therefore in this, that the community of life becomes conscious of its existence in the divine life. This advance is necessary; for, on the religious ground, man becomes conscious of his existence essentially as of a common existence. Religion can no more be understood as the produce of individual life, than language could be as that of an individual; on the contrary, both are manifestations of the community of life, the first in the direction towards God, the second towards the world—towards the one and towards the manifold. (See "Outlines of the Philosophy of the History of Mankind," Jan. 1816.)

The divine reality of universal life in a religious consciousness is expressed in the third article of the creed.

The origin and the growth of this life in the members of the Church is essentially an individual appropriation of the propitiatory death of Christ. First of all, because it is a real self-sacrifice. For as such the consciousness in the adoration is expressed, in relation to the brethren and in relation to God. In relation to the brethren, as the surrender of all selfishness, wrath, envy, hatred, and, in general, uncharitableness; in relation to God, in the surrender of our will unto His—of our wishes unto obedience, of our hopes unto resignation. Through these facts the universal Christian life of the Church, for the sake of which Christ died, advances and grows. If herein consists the appropriation of the propitiatory death of Christ, it follows that both the culminating point of the Christian worship and the commemoration of Christ's death are inseparable.

So far the religious conscience develops itself merely on the ground of the Apostolic creed. But the fact of the institution of the Lord's Supper is to be joined with it. It follows from what has been said above, that the partaking, commanded by Christ, of what he designates by the words "This is my body," &c., presents itself *necessarily* as

the positive ground of common worship in the relations indicated above. The single parts of the sacred action are therefore also to be connected with those ideas, but in such a way as not to deviate from Christ's institution.

I. The *Oblatio* of the ancient Church was, therefore, at first the natural token of the prayers which were offered by the faithful instead of the prefigurative and external gifts. These prayers may be threefold: first and principally, thanks and praise to God for the redemption through Christ; secondly, such prayers as spring from this feeling; lastly, the vow to live in Christ, and the prayer for strength to be able to do so. The *Oblatio*, viz. that which is offered, and the action of offering it, was therefore, in the last sense, the token of the real *Oblatio*, or of the self-offering. But this token was a natural one, because it represented at the same time that ground on which we base thanks, prayer, and self-sacrifice, and therefore the whole adoration. This association of ideas stands in connection with the relation to God. With regard to the relation to the partakers, the action of the *Oblatio* is a token of the Communion, and that which is offered (*Oblatum*) is the pledge of it in its symbolical signification; and it is not to be wondered at that the mysticism of the ancient Church saw in the material quality of the bread (*ex multis unum factum*), a symbol of the Communion and unity of the faithful in the Church.

Those who offer (*offerentes*) are therefore, according to the outward appearance, the single individuals, according to the real meaning, their community (*ecclesia, τὸ κοινόν*).

That which is offered (*oblatum*) is according to the outward appearance, the *elements;* symbolically the prayer (*preces*), in the highest sense the Church (*ecclesia*), the adoring faithful people themselves; sacramentally "Christi corpus et sanguis."

The *oblatio* is the action of offering agreeable donations to God, as a token of our adoration, and as a token of the ground of this adoration, Christ.

II. The *Consecratio* is

First:

The prayer for blessing the partaking of the Communion, and therefore a prayer for blessing the *elements.* This is called *sanctificatio* according to the idea: everything is sanctified by the word of God.

Secondly:

The prayer for blessing the partakers. But as the partaking of it presupposes a community, the Church, it is very natural that a general intercessory prayer should follow it. The connection between token

and meaning becomes necessarily more prominent here than in the oblation. All that is prayed and thought is done with reference to the approaching participation of the Communion, by which it becomes, as it were, sealed; the tokens themselves are considered already in their sacramental meaning, and therefore to us, according to Christ's promise, that on which our redemption is founded, and that which renders possible the growth and accomplishment of our spiritual life in the union with God. The vow of our self-sacrifice, connected with the *consecratio*, therefore, may very naturally take place here together with the prayer that God may accept, that is to say, consummate it, and with the profession of our faith that he is willing to do it, and will do it as far as we are Christ's members, and are to be one with him. We have therefore:

consecratio elementorum oblatorum,
consecratio precum oblatarum,
consecratio offerentium, ecclesiæ.

All this has no meaning as celebration of the Lord's Supper, without a following *communio*, even less than the *oblatio* would have without the *consecratio*. The pious contemplation of the truths of religion to which these actions refer may certainly be the object of devotion; one may understand the possibility that it should be made the foundation of an ecclesiastical service, but it is never, and can never become, the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

III. The *Communio*, the consummation of what has been prayed for in faith:

In relation to bread and wine, as far as they are the means of grace, spiritual nourishment, and the strengthening of spiritual life:

In relation to the partakers, as far as they participate in the redemption through Christ, and in his propitiatory death, in such a way that Christ's life in the faithful (the life of the Church, the being of the Holy Spirit) is growing through them, and that they die to the world and live in God.

IV. *Postcommunio.* After the *communio*, the religious feeling is first expressed as *thanks* for the blessing that has been received; and it is quite natural that the vow, which springs from the feeling of this blessing, should be expressed at this place, and that the real *oblatio* (the self-offering) should become connected with the *gratiarum actio* of the *postcommunio.*

All that has been said proves how differently the parts of this celebration may be developed, without deviating from Christ's institutions and without effacing the fundamental idea of the Christian worship. The ancient liturgies would show this difference by the side of the unity of the fundamental idea (as, in a similar manner, languages do, that are formed among spiritually kindred nations), if the composition of written formularies had not happened at rather a late period, and if the Roman Church had not succeeded first in suppressing the original rites which differed from the Roman ritual, and afterwards in destroying and partly adulterating those monuments. An impartial and conscientious study of the ecclesiastical authors of the first four centuries would establish both the unity of consciousness in the ancient Church and the difference of that fundamental idea. This would give an inward history of the development of the Christian worship, which ought to be the central point of a Christian ecclesiastical history.

The circumstances which separate the epochs of this development coincide exactly with the great epochs of general ecclesiastical history.

1. The separation of the Christian worship from the Jewish service, nearly cotemporary with the destruction of Jerusalem. — The whole, individual and common, pious and historical, religious consciousness connected itself now necessarily in a much more comprehensive manner with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The persecution and oppression of the Christians must, of course, have called forth the whole efficacy of the Communion with regard to the union of the partakers among themselves, as well as with regard to God and Christ. This I would call the consciousness of the Church as the community of Christ, efficacious for sanctifying the fundamental relations of human existence.

2. The triumph of the Christian religion in the Roman empire; the consciousness of the Church as to her vocation to busy herself with the affairs of civil life, as she had previously done with domestic life. — The *oblatio* became necessarily an action of long duration in the principal Churches; its solemnity necessarily increased from its worldly importance; the stewards of the sanctuary alone ruled in its precincts, whereas the laymen, including the lords of this world, stepped from their seats into the chancel only for a moment in order to offer their gifts. There was a growing tendency to propitiate and conquer the heathen element by giving more solemnity and dignity to the service. The *consecratio* contained the prayers for the empire of the world; it was also for its preservation that the *hostia immaculata* was offered and consecrated by prayer. The dogmatical controversies

penetrated into both parts, the *oblatio* and the *consecratio*, modifying the ceremonies as well as the prayers. But the *communio* sank, whilst the preparatory service rose. "In vain," St. Chrysostom exclaims, "we stand at the altar to administer the sacrament: you remain aloof." Hence the Communion of the clergy *sometimes* without the people communicating, although they remained present. But without Communion there was no celebration of the Lord's Supper, and indeed scarcely any common worship without this celebration. All examples of the contrary (brought forward to prove a celebration without Communion) are futile proofs of ignorance or of dishonesty.

At least half a century elapsed in this epoch, before a fixed liturgy was composed in writing. The order of celebration, to which ecclesiastical writers refer from whose works the terms of those liturgies are in part borrowed (and which have as much right to bear their names as some others have those of the evangelists and apostles), was in general very similar to the order of those later liturgies; but the single prayers, especially those of consecration, were, according to the testimony of St. Basil, nowhere fixed. Nevertheless, all extant liturgies preserve the consciousness of the Communion being the central point of the celebration, the preceding parts having been interpolated considerably later. Had the Codex Barberinus, once in the library of San Marco, not lost the Quinternio which contained the consecration (and who can suppose the loss accidental when Bessarion and Leo Allatius had a hand in it?), we should have an authentic record of this part of the service at least as old as the seventh century. The essential points, however, may still be discovered by comparing the more ancient Oriental translations with the Greek manuscripts.

It is remarkable that the regulation of the Canon, which was ordered to be made by Gregory the Great, and which has become of such importance for the history of the world, emanates from a man who is only known to us as "Scholasticus." A prolixity of the prayers between the *sanctus* (being the end of the *gratiarum actio*) and the words of Institution, viz. of the *oblatio* in the stricter sense, forms its principal peculiarity. This part is the more ancient element, only that, in its original form, it may have contained the consecration also. The dogmatic system of the next period could not have developed itself *in the way it did* out of the liturgy of the Spanish (Visigothic) Church.

3. The Consciousness of the Church as an external visible institution (*abstracte*). — The ancient consciousness of the Church as being the unity of the faithful, and existing only in them, is now by a metastasis transferred to this domain (that of the Church as government).

This becomes evident from the decay of the real *oblatio*, and the prevalence of the custom of celebrating mass without any Communion; so that the priest makes it the form of his official prayer, and thus represents externally, by his praying and receiving, the inner action of the faithful in the Communion.

The inquiries hitherto made have advanced so far as to show that the epoch of this change is the ninth century, in which also were written the influential commentaries of Paschasius Radbertus, Walafrid Strabo, Amalarius, and others. But still Walafrid says expressly, one must confess that at least three persons are necessary for the celebration of mass : *celebrans, ministrans, offerens.*

4. When the oblation had become an obsolete custom, the ecclesiastical idea of the *oblatio* was retained. It then became necessary to strengthen that ceremony by spiritualizing it. Every symbolicism becomes more free when it loses its substratum, and the symbolical explanation develops itself independently. As this threw the *communio* still more into the background, so on the other hand the spreading of the *missæ solitariæ* raised the importance of the symbolical oblation and consecration.

From that time the Canon of the Latin Church, with the exception of Spain, became universal, and in the West was considered in the same light as the Bible, viz. as the material of devotion. The text is interpreted according to an idea which is unhistorically conceived and developed. The more prominent part of the liturgy, viz. the oblation and consecration, became the basis of this system, and the central point of celebration was fixed in the act of consecration : the subject of the oblation (the offering person) being understood throughout to be the Church hierarchy, or what is called in the modern sense the Communion of the Saints. If we imagine, on the other hand, the vitality and creative power of the inner religious life, which received its direction and form from the most eminent minds of Europe, we cannot wonder that the inexhaustible and indelible mysticism of feeling concerning the adoration as a sacrifice became rapidly more and more fixed, and coalesced more intimately with the view of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Church. For the task of a philosophical and historical explanation had become impossible. The consciousness of the Church moved, as by a charm, within this circle, and could not satisfy itself but by the strongest expressions as to the reality of an ecclesiastical reproduction of the sacrifice.

5. It was only in the thirteenth century that the offertory became developed spiritually by the Franciscans, and was received into the

mass; a set of prayers, that God would mercifully accept the *oblatio*, were used instead of the psalm verses formerly sung by the choir during the offering of the people.

6. It is not clear at what time the practice commenced, now prevalent in the Latin Church, at least at Rome, of never giving the Communion to the people during the mass, as was formerly always done. Whenever there is a Communion of the people, the priest reads mass, to which the people listen, and after the *postcommunio* has been read, and the benediction given, the laity receive the host.

III.

THE NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE.

(Extract from a Letter to the late Rev. Dr. Nott, Winchester. Dated: On the Capitol, Christmas-day, 1829.)

THE idea of *sacrifice* is so much the natural and necessary foundation of every religious worship, that it appears as such, not only in the dispensation of God's revelations by the Scripture, but in all Pagan religions, from the Hindoo and Greek down to the negro and the inhabitant of California. The horrors and abominations which the desire of effecting the sacrifice produced, for instance in the service of Moloch, prove only how deeply the same is founded in human nature. When man feels his indestructible connection with the Divinity, in consequence of that voice of conscience, which St. Paul mentions when speaking of the Pagans, this connection appears to him *either* that of a *dependence* upon an almighty and benevolent power, or that of a *separation* from a more intimate connection, a real union broken by acts which provoked the divine wrath. The first feeling will prompt him to *thank*, the second to attempt to *propitiate*. As his prayers will be those of thanksgiving or those of penitence, so the acts by which he feels the want to show and manifest his feelings, will be attempts either to thank God or to soothe his wrath. All such acts fall under the idea and denomination of sacrifice, which implies that what is offered to God as a gift is considered on the one side as our property and part of ourselves, and on the other as belonging to Him. All sacrifices, therefore, are sacrifices of *praise and thanksgiving* (sacrificia laudis, θυσίαι εὐχαριστικαί), or of *atonement* (sacrificia propitiatoria, θυσίαι ἱλαστήριαι).

Now, it is a mere corollary from the first truth revealed to us by Scripture on the fall of mankind, that man by himself could neither effect such a real atonement for his sins as might appease divine justice, nor that act of thanksgiving which would answer eternal love. For, in order to offer this latter sacrifice, his mind ought to be first entirely relieved and delivered from the consciousness of sin and of the divine wrath, that is to say, a perfect, everlasting, and all-relieving

atonement ought first to have been found; and again, there being and remaining the fear and consciousness of the divine wrath in the mind of the natural man when approaching the Deity, every attempt to find and effect such an atonement by offering even the dearest thing or person, or by excruciating himself, must only increase the despair of being reconciled to God, or confirm men in external rites and ceremonies.

Only one way remained, therefore, for a divine revelation which for ages would prepare what was once to be accomplished, and this is the system of the Levitical worship and sacrifice, as a *type*, and as such a consoling *promise* and hope of what was reserved to the people of God, and through the same to all the nations of the earth.

The sacrifices of the Old Testament are typical, and according to their peculiar character, all sacrifices of thanksgiving, with the exception of that one great and awful sacrifice of propitiation or atonement, which in its typical nature is so clearly described and explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ was the real victim of propitiation, his death the only all-satisfactory sacrifice of atonement.

It is now necessary to establish that the sacrifices of the other order were *also typical*, that they did not *end*, but *begin*, with the great sacrifice of propitiation, and that they form that true and perfect worship of God in Christ, which we are called to perform. It is clear, from the elementary principles just laid down, that the atonement having once been found, the possibility was attained of accomplishing the real sacrifice of gratitude, of offering up the perfect thanksgiving. For he who believes in the atonement of Christ can approach God the Father with that feeling of pure gratitude and love which is not disturbed by the fear which the consciousness of our sinful state and our past sins necessarily creates and carries with it. Let us now examine more closely what the offering of gratitude, or the sacrifice of thanks and praise, means when considered in the light of the Gospel.

The Christian feels, that not only whatever he *has*, but also whatever he *is*, he has and is by the gift and grace of his Heavenly Father, and that his life and he himself belong to God, and are to be consecrated to his service. He therefore can only show his filial gratitude by offering himself and his whole life as a living sacrifice unto God. To do this the Christian is expressly exhorted by St. Paul in the twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and by St. Peter in that wonderful passage (1 Ep. ii. 6—9.) which contains the whole doctrine of Christian sacrifice, and of the true and reasonable service. The

same is said lastly in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii. 15.): "By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." This worship, therefore, is understood by the words of our Saviour, where he says (St. John, iv. 24.): "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him *in spirit and in truth*," all other worship being either external, or only a shadow of the truth revealed by and through Christ.

It seems evident that what is to be the principle of the *whole life* of the Christian is also to be the principal and central point of *that part* of it which is consecrated by divine institution, and by an internal necessity of the human mind, to the common worship or service of God in particular.

But it is necessary here to enter more fully into the nature of this service, as being not only *a* sacrifice, but the only possible, real, and true one, *the* sacrifice of redeemed man. As Christ was the only real victim of propitiation, so He is at once the only High Priest to us, who are priests and victims ourselves in gratitude, but only so far as we belong to his spiritual body, his real Church; and therefore, in the last instance, it must be said, that as Christ effected the only good and valid sacrifice of propitiation, thus He alone accomplished in His spiritual body the only good and valid sacrifice of praise and thanks. The former sacrifice was once made by Christ during the thirty-three years of his life on earth, and sealed by his death: the second is continually being made, through the succession of ages, from the moment of his ascension to heaven till his second coming. The *substratum* of the former is his own human body; that of the second is his spiritual body, the number of his elect, which is growing and increasing through all nations and ages to the final consummation of all things.

After having thus explained what we mean by saying that *the Christian* offers the real sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving by offering himself, we may repeat without being misunderstood, that in this real sacrifice, of which all others were only shadows or types, man united the functions of priest and of victim, of him who offers and of the thing offered. In all false and typical sacrifices subject and object were distinct, and became only united by acts of insanity and abomination, which acts on the other hand proved the inward consciousness, that the only real sacrifice is the human and self-offering sacrifice.

It is only, I presume, by considering the nature of the Christian

sacrifice, as the perpetual, constantly renewed *act* of gratitude and self-sacrifice of every redeemed soul in Christ's Church, or, if I may use such an expression, as the *pulsation of the Christian life* continuing through all ages, that we can thoroughly explain why neither the Saviour nor his Apostles left us any more distinct command and injunctions as to the form of the Christian service. Not only was its foundation, its central point, distinctly laid down, but also the celebration of the Lord's Supper as the sacred remembrance of his sacrifice and atonement, had been enjoined as the object of the Christian service in public worship.* The *act* of the redeemed Christian offering up himself as a living sacrifice of praise and thanks was to be sealed by the *remembrance* of the act of Christ, the atoning Saviour, which alone gives the Christian that free access to the Father which enables him to perform this act of gratitude in full hope and firm belief that He will ratify it, and hold it acceptable through Jesus Christ and on account of his merits. The spiritual food which we receive in the Lord's Supper, as it is *in general* a nourishment for the regenerate soul, so is it in particular a means of grace for being filled with that filial gratitude, and with that fraternal charity towards all men, which alone can make us offer ourselves to God with as much sincerity as humility, resign our will unto His holy will, and aspire to the perfect freedom of the children of God by giving up our self-will and self-love to his divine service. The worthy remembrance of the great sacrifice of atonement prompts us to make the holy vow of a consecration of ourselves in that spirit of thankfulness, by which the receiving of Christ's body and blood manifests its blessing within us. It is the sign and manifestation of that spiritual life which Christ has promised to feed and to strengthen by the partaking of his body and blood in faith. Christ feeds the members of his spiritual body, the faithful considered as one, his Church, by the sacramental signs and consecrated symbols of his own personal body and blood. This same truth may also be expressed in the following manner. The Church (viz. the real members of Christ's body united in brotherly fellowship, and ruled by Christ's word) in receiving Him, who offered Himself to be an everlasting propitiation for her, filled with gratitude and filial thank-

* This passage would be more clearly and correctly expressed thus:

Its foundation, its central point, was not only distinctly laid down, but also connected with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, as with the sacred remembrance of his sacrifice and atonement, when this celebration became a part of the public Christian worship. (1851.)

fulness, offers up herself as a living sacrifice of praise. Or: the Church receiving Christ's sacramental body and blood, expresses her gratitude, and manifests that life which is become her own as a living member of Christ's spiritual body, by offering up *herself* in gratitude and praise.

It is clear, that this truth, as simple as it is profound, may be expressed in many different ways: even that it *must* be expressed in different ways, according to the development of Christ's Church on earth, and of her consciousness of the internal grounds of her actions, according to the times and circumstances in which she finds herself, according to national character, and according to the individual moving of the Spirit within her. Thus, as the immortal Hooker so beautifully proves, even the Apostolical Church, if we had what we are totally without, the exact words and rites according to which the Apostles, in their various Churches, celebrated the Christian service, could not be, as to the letter and in its particulars, a model for all future times. It is its spirit, its fundamental regulations, which are to be followed by us, as the expression and working of that Divine Spirit, which dwelt so particularly in her.

But it is also clear, that the two great central points, the sacramental remembrance of the one sacrifice, and the offering up of the other, both prepared by the hearing of the word of God, and by the sincere acknowledgment of our sins and the profession of our faith, and aided finally by those means which present themselves as useful and salutary — it is also clear, I say, that these two great central points of the Christian service must have created and maintained, in the Christian Churches, a certain typical uniformity and that *consensus universalis* of the Churches, spread in different parts of the world, which at once will be the proof of their universal (Catholic) spirit and of their Christian liberty.

No fact in universal history is better proved than this. Striking as the differences and peculiarities of the several ancient Churches are, their uniformity is still more striking, and really wonderful. It is the same with the expressions of the *Fathers* of the Church about the Christian sacrifice. *All* their expressions and allusions, all their expositions and deductions, can only be explained and understood by that fundamental view of the Christian sacrifice, which has been laid down in these pages. *Sacrifice* is, and remains, the word expressing the essence of the service: the same word is used to denote that sacrifice which we commemorate in our prayers, which we confess in our creed, the blessed remembrance of which we celebrate in

the Lord's Supper, and likewise that sacrifice which is the constant act and manifestation of the Church herself, the praise and thanksgiving which, in the perfect sense of the word, is nothing but the *offering up of ourselves in charity and love*, to the will of our Heavenly Father and for the good of our brethren. In a similar way the name of this sacrifice of praise (εὐχαριστία) denotes also the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which is necessarily connected with the same.

Of all the Fathers of the Church no one speaks so profoundly on this awful subject as the great and immortal bishop of Hippon, St. Augustin, who, in the tenth book of his *Civitas Dei*, expounds the Christian doctrine of sacrifice. The sixth chapter of that book is particularly important; it begins with the definition of sacrifice: "A true sacrifice is every work which is done that we may be connected with God by holy fellowship, that is, referred to that end of all good by which we can be truly happy."*

He then goes on to show that even a work of charity, or of temperance and abstinence, if it be *not* done on account of God (propter Deum), is *not* a sacrifice. But we are commanded by the Apostle to do such acts from this motive (Rom. xii. 1.): "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." He adds most beautifully: "How much more then does the soul become a sacrifice, when it gives itself entirely up to God that it may be kindled by his divine love, and thus may lose the form of worldly concupiscence, being remodelled by becoming subject to him who is, as it were, the immutable form, and become acceptable to Him by what it received from His beauty! And this is what the Apostle says in what follows: 'And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove, what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God.' Since, therefore, the true sacrifices are works of mercy, either directed towards ourselves, or towards our neighbour; and whereas works of mercy are done for no other purpose but in order to free us from misery, and render us thus blessed—and this is only done by that good of which it is said, 'It is good for me to draw near to God;' it follows that the whole redeemed people (civitas), that is to say, the congregation and society of the Saints (faithful), is offered up to God

* "Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur, ut sancta societate inhæreamus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni quo veraciter beati esse possimus."

as a universal sacrifice by the High Priest, who, in his passion, offered himself up for us in the form of a servant that we might become the body of so great a head. For this form of a servant he offered up, in this form he was offered up: because, touching this, he is the mediator, in this same he is the priest, in this the sacrifice. Therefore the Apostle continues: 'For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith. For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another?' This is the sacrifice of Christians, 'many being one body in Christ.' And this, in the sacrament of the altar, known to the faithful, the Church celebrates, where she is taught that, in that thing [Christ's sacramental body] which she offers up, she herself *is offered up*." *

Neither this passage *nor any other* in any ancient Father can be understood, if applied to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, according to which the perpetual sacrifice of the Christian Church is a propitiatory one, and not one of praise, consisting not in the spiritual

* "Quanto magis anima ipsa, cum se refert ad Deum, ut igne amoris ejus accensa, formam concupiscentiæ secularis amittat eique tanquam incommutabili formæ subdita reformetur, hinc ei placens, quod ejus pulchritudine acceperit, fit sacrificium! Quod idem Apostolus consequenter adjungens: '*Et nolite*,' inquit, '*conformari huic sæculo: sed reformamini in novitate mentis vestræ, ad probandum vos, quæ sit voluntas Dei, quod bonum et beneplacitum et perfectum.*' Cum igitur vera sacrificia opera sint misericordiæ, sive in nos ipsos, sive in proximos, quæ referuntur ad Deum, opera vero misericordiæ non ob aliud fiant, nisi ut a miseria liberemur, ac per hoc ut beati simus; quod non fit, nisi bono illo, de quo scriptum est: *Mihi autem adhærere Deo bonum est;* profecto efficitur, ut tota ipsa redemta civitas, hoc est congregatio societasque sanctorum, universale sacrificium offeratur Deo per sacerdotem magnum, qui etiam se ipsum obtulit in passione pro nobis, ut tanti capitis corpus essemus, secundum formam servi. Hanc enim obtulit, in hac oblatus est; quia secundum hanc mediator est, in hac sacerdos, in hac sacrificium est. . . . . '*Dico enim*,' inquit, '*per gratiam Dei, quæ data est mihi, omnibus, qui sunt in vobis, non plus sapere, quam oportet sapere, sed sapere ad temperantiam, sicut unicuique Deus partitus est secundum mensuram. Sicut enim in uno corpore multa membra habemus, omnia autem membra non eosdem actus habent, ita multi unum corpus sumus in Christo; singuli autem, alter alterius membræ, habentes dona diversa secundum gratiam, quæ data est nobis.*' Hoc est sacrificium Christianorum: '*multi unum corpus in Christo.*' Quod etiam sacramento altaris fidelibus noto frequentat ecclesia, ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re, quam offert, ipsa offeratur."

self-offering of the faithful, who are taught by the word of God, and refreshed by the sacramental body of Christ, but in the saying of the words of consecration, or rather in the repetition of the words of the Institution of the Sacrament, made by the priest over the host.

No change ever was greater, no perversion had ever more pernicious results for the whole history of Christ's Church, and still none was easier, was more natural, and as it were necessary, so soon as the fundamental ideas of *Church*, *Priesthood*, and *Sacrifice* were perverted from their highest spiritual sense to the outward and heathenish one, according to which the Church is the governing body of Christ's faithful people. Priests are the ministers of the Church, and therefore sacrifice is the sacred work or action which these priests perform as such. As soon as the promises made to the real Church of God (which is contained in the external Church, as the believers were in the ark) are applied in their full extent to this external Church and even its governors, and as soon as the right and duty of spiritual priesthood exercised by every Christian under the one great High Priest are superseded by the acts and privileges of the officiating ministers of that Church, the Communion becomes an accessory only to the consecration, that is to say, to the formal act of the priest; and the perpetuity of sacrifice, taught by Malachi and by the whole Scripture, as well as by the Fathers, instead of being found in the ever-new act of self-offering of regenerated souls in the holy fellowship of Christ's Church, must be looked for in the never-ceasing repetition of that act of consecration as being a repetition of the one great act of atonement made on the cross.

The great epoch in ecclesiastical history, which I consider as the critical point in the history of the liturgy, is the *fifth century*. At that period the Communion ceased to be generally frequented by all the faithful present, except such as were prohibited by the canons of the Church from drawing near the altar. Down to this period the real εὐχαριστία, the real *act* of the Christian service, the offering up of the assembled people, as of one, to God in praise and thankfulness, was necessarily connected with the celebration of the Communion. The expressions relating to the sacrifice offered up, and those belonging to the sacrifice commemorated, were always united in the same service; so that, for instance, the *Præfatio*, "Sursum corda" (a formula which had become of almost universal usage even in the second century, as the beginning of the solemn offering of praise and thanksgiving), might appear also as the beginning of the celebration of the Communion, although it is evident that it must be attributed exclusively to the

first, and not to the second, as soon as the liturgy for the one (the standing and unchangeable centre of the service) is to be separated from the celebration of the Sacrament. The separation of these two so very distinct elements ought at that time to have been made, in order to preserve the purity and independence of the spiritual character of the Christian sacrifice, as well as the right sense of the celebration of the Lord's Supper according to the Institution. But this separation undoubtedly then seemed dangerous: the spiritual sense of Christianity was already lowered; probably it was feared that the positive sense of sacrifice might dwindle into a deistical or sentimental one, and hopes were entertained that the people might one day return to the use of the ancient Church, and all receive the Communion at every Communion service.

The next step was the celebrating of the Communion by the clergy ministering at the altar: after this the last step was unavoidable, namely the celebration of the Communion by the officiating priest alone, that is to say, without any Communion (in the old sense) taking place.

All these changes were merely *liturgical*, but every liturgical change reacts necessarily on the *doctrine*. The consecration and the showing of the consecrated host became the most conspicuous part of the service; on that act being performed, the faithful were to remember the passion of Christ, and the institution of his blessed Sacrament. The doctrine of Transubstantiation itself was only a consequence of this practical view produced by the liturgy; a scholastic consequence, the denial of which seemed inconsistent with that practice. Such is the character of human nature, that unless it be guided by divine revelation, it will find out and substitute an outward practice for the inward act, and supply, by an external rite, the want of the spiritual act which man is commanded to perform, and which he feels the need of when not misdirected. Hitherto the Church had only known such expressions as these: Christ offered himself up for the Church—the Church offers up herself, and as signs of this act of her own, she (the faithful people) brings or offers to the altar her gifts (oblations) as well as her prayers. But now a third expression came into use: the Church offers up Christ, by repeating on the altar the consecration of his body made on the cross. If this is to be the Christian sacrifice, then the real body once offered, and the sacramental body now unceasingly offered on the altar, must be the same, must be identical, otherwise, the Christian sacrifice would be void and only a shadow, whereas it must contain reality as well as be perpetual.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation, closely connected as it is with the substitution of the sacrifice of consecration for the spiritual and only real one, of the souls of the united faithful people, is therefore far from being the central point of controversy. The whole question which has principally engaged the attention of Protestant divines in their controversies with the Romish Church, and given rise to the great division in the Protestant Church itself, viz., "*What is the effect of the prayers of consecration* (which are preceded by the words of Institution, and do not consist in these words alone) *on the elements?*" is one which lies entirely out of the view of the ancient Church. It never formed a distinct object of the consideration of her Fathers, or the deliberations of her Councils: many orthodox Fathers would have declared it an indifferent point, others a point not to be answered; none would have given his peculiar opinion as a point of doctrine. The question was not started, till the whole centre of Christian worship had been changed; and it was one of the evils entailed by the Romish Church on the new Reformed one, that even her own internal discussions moved on this point, and made that answer a point of paramount importance, and a ground of schism and separation.

The Reformed Churches all agreed with one voice, as by inspiration, that the blessed Communion had been changed into a mere representation of the same in which no communion took place. They proved that the spiritual sacrifice of the Fathers was widely different from the sacrifice of the Mass, and laid down the principle that no celebration of the Lord's Supper was allowable except there were communicants.

This was the second critical period of the old Greek and Latin Church; none of its canons had yet pronounced, as a doctrine, the liturgical *fact* established by the usage of centuries, "that the sacrifice of the Mass was essentially a propitiatory one." The Council of Trent made this declaration, which may be considered the deathblow of the Romish Church, though intended to support and to maintain it; and the later Fathers of that same Church were constantly more and more agreed upon the further conclusion which completes the new system, that the central point of this sacrifice is the consecration, which the Romanists always incorrectly consider to be the recital of the words of Institution. Bossuet is most decided on this point; communion with him is only an accessory, the feeding of those who are present on the flesh of the victim of propitiation; and feeling how much this is at variance with the type of the Levitical worship, where it is declared an abomination to eat of the flesh of the victim

consecrated for propitiation, he took upon himself to declare this to be a great mystery of the new covenant.

The real point of controversy is therefore about *the nature of the Christian sacrifice.* It is easy to establish the doctrine of the spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanks, but the most profound writers among the Roman Catholics (as Pascal and the whole school of Port Royal) abound in this sense. But the real point of controversy, in its most particular form, may be reduced to this:

"Is the doctrine of the Council of Trent incompatible or not with that doctrine of the spiritual sacrifice?"

They wish to represent us as heretics, the characteristic of which always is, to believe only a *part* of the truth. They pretend that, according to their doctrine, as much stress is laid on the spiritual sacrifice by them as by the Reformed, who, according to their view, have given up and lost the sacrifice altogether, and reduced their worship to a mere deistical meeting to hear a sermon.

It must therefore be the final object of the Reformed Christian Church, to show, not only what the real sacrifice of Christians is, but also to make it the central point of her own service, which is the *viva vox ecclesiæ*, more powerfully influential than all books of doctrine; and thus to prove, that, in its most perfect and pure sense, this Christian sacrifice *cannot* be established and understood, so long as the sacrifice of the Mass is not abolished.

The most natural, general, and energetic way of thus placing the truth of Christianity in opposition to its degeneration is therefore by the *Liturgy*; and, in order to effect this, we necessarily must do what the Church of the fifth century did not choose to do, and what the Reformers of the sixteenth century were prevented from doing by many circumstances, and particularly by the gross abuses which had crept into the Church through the perversion of the meaning of the awful word Sacrifice. These immortal men discovered the whole truth, as their writings prove; but when the time was come for the Churches, reformed by their heroic efforts, to have organized themselves according to the actual state of the Church and the new elements of devotion produced by the Reformation, the new controversies which had sprung up directed their attention to other points. Here and there also the great spirit of those men had disappeared, and others with a more contracted and limited view of Christian doctrine and Christian Church, at all events not possessing the grand and extensive ideas which characterized those heroes of the Gospel, had taken their place. . . . . .

SECOND SECTION.

ESSAYS ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

I.

THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS; THEIR GENERAL CHARACTER, ORIGIN, AND IMPORTANCE.

THERE was a book in the ante-Nicene Church, in that age which as a whole we may call the Apostolic, and of which Hippolytus, Origen, and Cyprian represent the latter part — there was among the Christians of those two centuries a book, called Apostolic in an eminent sense, as being the work of all the Apostles. It was a book more read than any one of the writings of the Fathers, and in Church matters of greater weight than any other; a book before the authority of which the bishops themselves bowed, and to which the Churches looked up for advice in doubtful cases. And this book was not the Bible. It was not even a canonical book, but in form a work of fiction; which purporting to have emanated from the Apostles, was excluded as spurious, by most of the Fathers, from the books of the New Testament.

This book was called sometimes, the "Doctrine," more generally and properly, the "Ordinances," or "Constitutions," "of the Apostles."

Whoever has read those interesting, and in many respects precious relics, which we call the Apostolic Fathers, will readily grant that their greatest charm consists, on the whole, in the image which they exhibit of the life of the Church in the interesting and important but dark age which followed that of the Apostles of Christ. The works of the Apostolic Fathers of the second century, in particular, are more eminent and

more attractive to us as emanations and as monuments of the universal life of which they give evidence, than as individual productions, and as documents of individual thought, learning, and power. And still, when we look upon these Fathers from this point of view, we soon become aware that they, as well as those of the third century, acquaint us with that universal Christian life only indirectly, unconsciously, and as it were accidentally, and that they all presuppose in the reader a perfect knowledge of the real state of that life of the Church. They are occasional Epistles, or special treatises, or apologies, addressed to Jewish or Pagan opponents and adversaries. In none of these forms are they intended to communicate to us what every properly instructed and initiated Christian then knew. On the contrary, all these writings presuppose more or less the knowledge of what was required of a Christian man or woman to know, or to confess, to pray, to do, to practise, or to avoid, and what was in general the custom and order as well of domestic and private as of common Christian life, both in worship and in government and discipline; and of all this very little is found in the Bible.

I have already pointed out in the foregoing chapter, that it is one of the divine characteristics of the Christian religion, that our canonical books contain neither an order for worship nor a constitution. But whoever has an eye for reality must see that the Christian community could not have existed many years after the death of the two great Apostles, nor have survived the fall of Jerusalem and the death of St. John, had not, even then, at the beginning of the second century, customs and traditional rules been formed, and continued to be formed, to regulate the Christian life in the different Churches, and keep up the unity of the Spirit among them. I believe we know the fact, but even if we did not, we might safely affirm, that the Christian community could not have developed itself as it has done, and have maintained its unity in the second and third centuries, unless that organizing social spirit had continued, and unless those customs, traditions, and regulations had, at an early period, been written down and put together, more or less complete, and liable to changes and additions, in the earlies

and leading Churches of the highly civilized Hellenic and Roman world, both in the East and the West.

The Christians of that age were scriptural, but still more Apostolic and catholic. They trusted for the preservation of that Apostolicity and that unity both to the Scripture and to the Spirit given to the Church. But this very faith had prompted them to hedge in that spiritual life and Apostolic consciousness with the forms, customs, and precedents which, they knew or believed, had come down to them, directly or indirectly, from the Apostles. We have seen that there certainly existed in the age of Hippolytus a stirring and organizing episcopacy within those principal Churches, as active as any ever has been, and that there was still a constitutional aristocratic action in the clerical government of each Church, and even a remnant of popular right in the congregation; in short, that there were in that age all the elements required to provide for the emergencies of the times. But, by the side of that, we see Hippolytus point, in matters of Church discipline and order, to the Ecclesiastical Rules or "Definitions," as energetically and authoritatively as in matters of doctrine; that is to say, respecting our knowledge of Father, Son, and Spirit, he points invariably and exclusively to Scripture. When giving the character of bishop Zephyrinus (ix. p. 284.), he says, "the man was ignorant in the ecclesiastical rules" (ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ ὅροι). This expression, "Definitions," had precisely the same signification at that time as the "Canons," or "Rules," had subsequently to the Council of Nice; for originally the term Canon was only used to denote a rule of faith, not of discipline. Hippolytus, in attacking the bishop of Rome, could hardly have appealed to those Principles of Ecclesiastical Law, unless some of these regulations, upon which ecclesiastical discipline was based, and which, as a whole, were considered of Apostolic authority, had been committed to writing, and were preserved in the archives of the presbytery.

But we have the same, and still more explicit, evidence from Irenæus. I allude here, in particular, to the celebrated "Pfaffian Fragment" of Irenæus, of the authenticity of which no reasonable doubt can be entertained. I have discussed else-

where its merits and sense, and it is only necessary here to refer to the text given in my first Appendix, and to the authors there quoted. Irenæus says that those who have followed the second ordinances (διατάξεις) of the Apostles, that is to say, those who have studied and who accept them *, know what the Christian offering and sacrifice is. The most natural interpretation of this passage seems to be, that it refers to such Apostolic injunctions and ordinances as are not contained in the canonical writings of the Apostles, but still were received by the Church as Apostolic, and therefore must have been written down in one way or another when Irenæus wrote; that is to say, not later than the second part of the second century. Indeed, the Protestant writers, who look for another interpretation, do so merely out of that unreasonable fear of the word Tradition, of which I have spoken in the first of these Fragments. Certainly those ordinances existed originally as verbal tradition, or at least only in records of single Churches, not in a general authoritative form; but they were observed, and therefore were living practical rules, in the leading Apostolic congregations, such as Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, and Ephesus. These Churches existed at that time perfectly independent of one another, and with a considerable difference as to the form both of worship and of government and discipline. The well-known difference as to the celebration of Easter is not the only one. But they were all united together by three great points: by Scripture, by the consciousness of the unity and efficacy of the Spirit, and by the brotherly communications which passed from time to time among them.

It is to such ordinances, known and accepted in single Churches, and considered by them as rules of general authority, though only as to discipline, not as rules of faith, and at that time not committed to writing, that Clement of Rome refers in his Epistle to the Corinthians, which is not only authentic, but was composed before St. John wrote his Gospel. Clement, in this Epistle, speaks of regulations and arrangements of the Apostles regarding the office of the Elders, and claims respect

* As to Rothe's interpretation, see his "Anfänge," p. 373.

for them. It requires no argument to prove that these Apostolic regulations, such as, that the office of Presbyter was to be considered as an office for life, unless a Presbyter became superannuated or forfeited the office by misconduct, are no more scriptural than infant baptism is, although they are of much more ancient origin.

If Clement, therefore, claimed respect for that regulation, and, as the result showed, obtained it, he appealed to the same authority which Irenæus alludes to as "second regulations;" only that Clement certainly could not refer to anything written. Nothing, therefore, is more natural than what really happened. The name of Clement of Rome was used as that of the author of these regulations; he having been the Apostolic man who had first recorded ordinances or injunctions of the Apostles, not found in Scripture, or who at least had first claimed universal authority for them. His name, and the names of the Apostles, are used as a mythical form to express an undoubted fact, namely, the Apostolicity of such injunctions as to the substance. The sense of the whole fiction is, that whatever in those ordinances is not directly the work of the Apostles must be considered as Apostolic, as coming from their disciples, who, with their followers in the next generation, had continued their work in the same spirit, Clement of Rome being the first and most prominent among them. The consciousness of Apostolicity in the second and third centuries justifies, or at least excuses and explains, such a fiction, which, moreover, could deceive nobody who reflected on the subject. St. Jerome has, in the letter to Lucian already quoted, the following very remarkable words: "I think it right briefly to admonish thee, that Apostolic traditions (particularly those which do not affect the faith) ought to be observed as they have been delivered, and that the customs of some should not be destroyed by those of others. . . . Let the people of every province stand by their own, and consider the precepts of their forefathers as Apostolic laws." This advice, when properly understood, is very sensible: and, at all events, highly instructive as to the view of the ancient Church. St. Augustin adopted the same method, following an injunction of St. Ambrose.

Now the collection of these Apostolic regulations and injunctions, insisted upon by Clement, and referred to by Irenæus as known to the Catholics and acknowledged by them in their disciplinary, but still Apostolic, authority —such a book, I say, next in authority to the Bible, and affording much information as to the life of the ancient Church, which the Bible does not and cannot give, is still in existence. It is true, the book is merely mentioned by our ante-Nicene Fathers, and we have no verbally accurate quotation from it in any author of the fourth century, but only from the sixth downward. But still we find in our present text, passages which correspond almost literally with those quoted by Epiphanius. How is it then that the origin of this book has never been satisfactorily explained? and that for a century and a half the book has not (so far as I know) been even separately reprinted, and therefore, if ever, is only read by those who have recourse to the rare and expensive collections of the Apostolic remains? Mainly for two reasons: first, because in the seventeenth century the prejudices of all parties precluded men from coming to any satisfactory solution; and, secondly, because modern criticism has been left to the Germans, for whom reality has no charm. But we may add two particular reasons: because we have hitherto been acquainted with only one collection, and that the least genuine: and because Hippolytus had become almost a mythical person.

We shall endeavour to establish first some fixed points, upon which to found our further inquiry.

Of course, it does not follow from our having Constitutions or Ordinances of the Apostles, that they are the same as those to which the men of the second and third centuries refer, as will soon be pointed out. Neither does it follow, that, if we find corresponding passages in that collection, we possess, on the whole, the same text which the writers of the fourth century had before them. But it was a mistake to suppose that there existed only one sacred book, which, under the name of "Doctrine," or "Ordinances," "of the Apostles," was used in the Church, and was highly respected as connected with the Apostles. I shall not only prove, that we have a different and a less interpolated text of the so-called eighth book of our

Greek Constitutions, but, besides, I hope to show the originality, and superior authenticity, of three other texts, one representing the traditions of the Church of Antioch, and two of Alexandrian origin, that is to say, having authority or being used in the Church of Egypt, as the other was in that of Syria. Indeed, how could it be otherwise? Each of those great Churches, not to say every Apostolic and influential Church, not only was independent of the others, but had its own regulations and forms, of discipline, especially with respect to the reception and instruction of the catechumens, one of the most prominent parts of the ancient discipline. The work in question was, in a great measure, of local origin as to the nucleus of its contents: I mean, as to those customs and regulations which were observed in the Church in question. But in all it existed very early, and everywhere as a fiction, so far as its composition is concerned: for it professes to have been dictated by the Apostles to Clement. Unfortunately, the Greek text which we happen to possess is dilated, patched up, and interpolated. In the first six books, which form the first collection, the whole text is rewritten in a rhetorical style by a late compiler. Even the two remaining collections, now called the seventh and eighth books, are more interpolated than any others with which we are acquainted. And we now are acquainted with three such, all differing from the Greek and from one another.

But there is a collateral fact, to which justice must equally be done, the concordance of these different texts, the Coptic, Abyssinian, and Syrian, in the most important articles, not only as to substance, but even as to form, with the corresponding passages of the nucleus of those two books, particularly the eighth. This fact is irreconcilable with the assumption that the whole is a work of fiction, and of a very late date, and that it represents nothing but imaginary traditions invented by impostors. For, however well such persons might have been acquainted with ancient usages and with the writings of the old Fathers, their works could never have been recommended and read so universally in the East, nor could they have invented forms so simple and primitive.

All these distinct collections present, on the whole, the same

groundwork, which was Apostolic, or supposed Apostolic, custom. As to the age of the compilation, the latter part of the third century is the horizon to which most of the ancient ordinances have been more or less adapted: but none of these ordinances reaches higher than the episcopal system, in the ecclesiastical sense, introduced by St. John in Proconsular Asia (Ionia). It is, therefore, not to be wondered at, that we find in none of them that Apostolic regulation respecting the Elders to which Clement refers. On the contrary, whereas Clement speaks of an ordinance which supposes only two orders in the Church, Elders, called also Overseers (Bishops), and Deacons; the canons of our Constitutions already stand upon the fully developed ecclesiastical system, the episcopal, and threefold, instead of twofold, division of clerical offices. The primitive system is, indeed, implied by one or two passages, which have been overlooked, where those offices are only occasionally named: but we know that late in the second century many Churches were governed by presbyters supported by deacons. Now, waiving this difference, we may say, that the farthest horizon is throughout the age posterior to Clement, who represents the end of the Johannean age, or the first century. But, if we look deeper, we shall find that the ordinance of the Apostles recorded by Clement is really the basis of that whole ecclesiastical system. All those ordinances imply, in every canon which relates to the office of bishop or presbyter, that it is for life. Now, as this principle rested, not upon scriptural authority, but upon the latest personal arrangements of the Apostles, and, in particular, of St. Peter and St. Paul, that ordinance, appealed to by Clement, presupposes again the ordinances contained in the Pastoral Epistles.

From the general view here taken of the origin of the Apostolical Constitutions, and the different stages through which they passed subsequently to the publication of the Pastoral Letters, the circumstance of the copy used by Epiphanius at the end of the fourth century, containing a few passages now either wholly expunged, or the tenor of which is of a directly opposite character, although its groundwork was the same as that of our Greek Constitutions, can easily be explained. We have, on the

other side, as will appear hereafter, the undoubted fact, that our texts contain ordinances and describe customs which we must refer to an earlier period than that of Irenæus. I think, therefore, that as the name (Ordinances, Constitutions) is the same, we may safely quote that celebrated passage of Irenæus, which dates from the latter part of the second century, in proof that at that early time there existed in the Church a collection of customs and ordinances ascribed to the Apostles. I believe we may also refer to the words of Clement, as proving that such customs and ordinances existed traditionally, before the end of the first century. They must therefore have been acknowledged by many, if not by all the Churches, as of substantial although not scriptural authority, before the year 88, when Clement died, and consequently before St. John wrote his Gospel.

Now, it is self-evident, from what has been said in the first part of these Fragments, that these traditional customs, ordinances, or injunctions, which were gradually collected and committed to writing, must from the very first have comprized two elements, the ritual and the constitutional. These two elements must, at all events, have formed three chapters; that is to say, they must have treated first, on the teaching and the reception of the catechumens; secondly, on the worship and on the rites; and thirdly, on the government and the whole constitutional discipline of the Church. A fourth chapter must also have been formed before these ordinances were collected and digested into a compendium of Apostolic tradition, as the legacy of the Apostles. Such are the ethic precepts, containing the application of the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, and other general oracles of Christ, as well as of the exhortations and advice of the Apostles, to the domestic and social life of the Christians. We find, indeed, this ethic element, in a more literary, modern form, prefixed, by way of introduction, to the special Canons at the beginning of each collection. The same ethic and moral element appears, also, as the prominent feature in popular novels and other fictions, of which form the earliest literature of the primitive Christians consisted. These books were specially intended for the catechumens, as a prepa-

ration for baptism: as Athanasius says expressly of the Apostolical Constitutions themselves.

But however small the external evidence may be as to the early existence, not only of the matter, but also the fictitious form of the "Ordinances of the Apostles," there are two irrefragable witnesses to their existence and authority before the Nicene epoch: Athanasius, who wrote from about 330 to 360; and Epiphanius, of the early Theodosian period, whose work was begun in 375.

Athanasius, in his thirty-ninth Festal Letter, after reciting the canonical books received and used by the Church, gives a list of such works as (he says) are not canonical, but intended by the Fathers to be read by those who come to be instructed in the true doctrine*: namely, the Book of Wisdom and the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, and the so-called "Doctrine of the Apostles," and "the Shepherd." Now, the date of the "Shepherd, or Hermas," named after the "Doctrine of the Apostles," is known. It was written by the brother of bishop Pius, about 150. The author of the "Synopsis of the Holy Scripture," in the works of Athanasius, speaking of the "controverted" parts (*ἀντιλεγόμενα*) of the New Testament, which are read to the people, mentions, amongst others, the "Doctrine of the Apostles," and the "Clementines;" and adds: — the truer and inspired (*θεόπνευστα*) parts of them have been transcribed (*μετεφράσθησαν*, which means not translated simply, and implies modifications as well as omissions). Eusebius had previously mentioned the "Doctrine of the Apostles" among the spurious "books of the New Testament," together with the "Revelations of St. Peter," a vision which the author of the Muratorian fragment mentions as a canonical book of the Catholic, at least of the Roman Church, read to the people as well

* *Οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον.* This applies to the Apocrypha as well as to the Hermas. Drey, following Cotelerius, translates it (p. 3.): "which, by the order of the bishops, are read in the churches." (See also p. 82.) As to the mention of the book of Esther, it applies, of course, to the apocryphal Alexandrian "Fragments of the Book of Esther."

as St. John's Apocalypse; adding, however, that some protested against its being thus read (as a canonical book).

We see from these quotations that the writers of the earlier part of the fourth century, such as Eusebius and Athanasius, call the book in question the "Doctrine" or "the Doctrines" of the Apostles, and so does the author of the "Synopsis" in the works of Athanasius. It is, in itself, the most natural supposition, that this "Doctrine of the Apostles" is no other than the "Constitutions or Ordinances of the Apostles;" for otherwise we should know nothing of a book so highly respected and so much read. But Zonaras *, in noticing the condemnation of the "Apostolical Constitutions" by the Concilium Trullanum of 692, expressly alludes to the "Doctrine," because he mentions it when speaking of their being rejected. The title, indeed, applies very well to our book, which begins and ends with ethic admonitions, although it principally relates to positive ordinances respecting the ritual or the discipline. The reason assigned by the Council for their rejection was the circumstance of the book having been interpolated by heretics (Cod. 112, 113.). The later Byzantine writers, Photius at their head, speak of the eight books of our "Constitutions," though bearing the fictitious names of Clement and of the Apostles, yet as of ancient and respectable, perhaps even orthodox productions. The use of some expressions, or the absence of some theological terms, lays them under suspicion of Arianism, an unjust charge brought against our "Constitutions" in common with all the ante-Nicene Fathers who wrote on those subjects.

So much for the external evidence and historical probabilities. But the most convincing arguments are the contents themselves. As soon as we get rid of all that belongs to the bad taste of the fiction, some ethic introductions and all occasional moralizing conclusions, and, generally, everything manifestly rewritten with literary pretension; and lastly, as soon as we expunge some interpolations of the fourth and fifth centuries, which are easily discernible, we find ourselves unmistakeably in the midst of the life of the Church of the second and third centuries.

* Canon 60., compared with his explanations of Canon Laodic. 60.

We have now, I believe, the documentary proofs in our hands, that the present Greek text is the least original and the most dilated and interpolated of all which are preserved. The two latter books, nevertheless, and they alone, contain most of the original matter. In our Appendix, the curious reader will find an extract of all those hitherto neglected or unknown texts, and, wherever it appeared important, the very words given and compared with each other. I refer in particular to the text of the Coptic ordinances of the Apostles and the commentary on them.

We have given, in the beginning of this volume, the genuine substance of these most precious relics. Who can read them without respect, and, if he have a Christian heart, without emotion? Who does not feel that they indeed deserve to be placed next to the Bible? Who can doubt as to the age when such customs and ordinances were formed and recorded?

After having established the fundamental points necessary for forming an impartial judgment on the Apostolical Constitutions, and having sketched out the method of research which I have pursued, I shall add a few words respecting the history of the criticism of this remarkable production.

The importance attributed to it by the English critics of the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, with few exceptions, and the strong and almost universal belief in the antiquity and authenticity of the nucleus of its contents, form the most brilliant part of English ecclesiastical criticism. It is true, none of those eminent men attempted to point out its natural origin and authentic elements; and their ultimate conjectures as to the former are as discordant as they are unhistorical. While bishop Pearson refers the origin of the Apostolical Constitutions to the Apostles or their disciples, and while Grabe even calls them verbal traditions written down in the beginning of the second century, bishop Beveridge ascribes them to Clemens of Alexandria, supposing there to have been an error in the tradition which mistook him for the Roman. Such a mistake tradition could never have

made, and so learned a man should never have fallen into such a one himself. Archbishop Usher goes to the other extreme. Exaggerating the importance of some later elements, which had been foisted in, he supposes the Constitutions to have been written in the sixth century: an opinion in which he is followed by the German Ittig, and by Father Tillemont; but which is in opposition to all historical and internal evidence. If these shrewd and learned men were hampered by their conventional theological views in one way, the pious and learned Whiston was driven, by his opposite predilections, into a still wider and indeed absurd conjecture. He started the almost incredible notion, that our Constitutions were dictated by Christ to his disciples in the forty days after the resurrection. But these defects, and even this eccentricity, do not diminish the merit of the English school, for having deeply felt, and maintained as well as they could, the character of the work, as relating to a document of the ancient Church of the ante-Nicene period.

As to the research of the Protestant critical school in Germany, the criticism upon these Constitutions is undoubtedly its weakest part, and very naturally so. What they know how to handle best is thought, the ideal part of history: what is farthest from their grasp is reality. The only valuable portion of the Apostolical Constitutions is their reality: the speculative or ideal portion is entirely insignificant. This is the only explanation of the fact of Neander having scarcely made any use of the treasures contained in them; and that while the tedious novel of the Clementine fictions has been made the subject of very deep (although, I am afraid, equally premature) researches (by Schliemann, Hilgenfeld, Ritschl, and others), the Constitutions have neither been reprinted nor commented upon. At most they have received a look of disdain from the German critics, with two honourable exceptions. Rothe, alone, has given a sensible general view of the state of the question, in a note, full of information and good sense, to his work on the origin of the ecclesiastical constitution; and Krabbe, as a young man, instituted an inquiry into the question itself.

About the same time (1832), a German divine of the critical Roman Catholic school of Germany, Von Drey, made the

Greek Constitutions and the Canons of the Apostles the subjects of a more elaborate investigation, and entered very deeply into the merit of these relics. He comes to the same result at which Krabbe arrived — the ante-Nicene origin of the book; and, as to a part of the contents, has proved his case better than his predecessors. But when he considers the first six books to be the composition of an ancient ante-Nicene author, he betrays great want of philological accuracy and critical tact. Again, while acknowledging that the seventh as well as eighth book bear a peculiar character, he fails to see that they are not supplements at all, but that each of them forms a separate collection, and one which, in its original parts, is as genuine and primitive as the first six books are the reverse. Hence arose the untenable idea, that these first six books are formed on an original and regular plan, instead of being a rhetorical essay, full of interpolations, single collections containing only a few genuine gems. The final result at which he arrives, that they were intended for the catechumens, whereas the seventh was reserved for the initiated, and the eighth, the Pontificale (Episcopal ritual), for the priests alone, falls to the ground together with the supposition from which it is obtained. These fundamental defects in his researches prevent him from coming to the simple historical solution.

We give this time the Greek text (old and new) in the Analecta, together with the analysis of the whole work, which formed part of the first edition, and established the fact, that the first six, the seventh, and the eighth books are three parallel collections, and that the two latter include a nucleus manifestly dilated by later additions.

But we have at this place to consider the eighth book in particular, because it is directly connected with the principal object of our inquiry. For we find the key to its composition in a lost work of Hippolytus, which, very probably with omissions, and certainly with some interpolations, forms the introduction of that most important part of the Greek text. Before I proceed to the solution of this problem, I submit to my readers the Appendix, in which I stated the reasons for my conjecture respecting the Syrian text of the first six books.

APPENDIX

ON THE APOSTOLICAL CANONS IN THE CODEX BARBERINUS AND THE PETERSBURG MS., AND ON THE DISCOVERIES AND RESEARCHES OF BICKELL AND ZENKER RESPECTING THE SYRIAN TEXT OF THE CONSTITUTIONS.

(Reprinted from the first edition of "Hippolytus and his Age," vol. iii. pp. 173—176.)

"The celebrated MS. of the Barberini Library at Rome (N. 17.) of the ninth century, written in uncial letters, to which allusion has been often made in this Part, and in the Second Volume, as exhibiting the most authentic text of the Greek Liturgies, contains also a fragment of the Apostolical Canons. It begins with canon 57. of the text of Cotelerius (εἴ τις κληρικὸς ἢ λαϊκός), fol. 536., with which a new quaternio opens. That canon is, in the MS., the 62nd; the number is now covered by a piece of parchment; but canon 59. of Cotelerius is numbered 64., and so on to canon 75. (fol. 541.), which answers here to canon 80. The 76th canon of Cotelerius (the absurd Catalogue of the Canonical Books) is unknown to that MS., in which the 75th canon is followed by the epilogue: ταῦτα καὶ (instead of δὲ) περὶ κανόνων, &c. The various readings of the preserved text are insignificant. The difference in the numbering also is not important. The Arabic and Ethiopic collections number 81.

"Fol. 548—550. give chapter 15. of the vulgar text of the eighth book of the Apostolical Constitutions, under the title, Διατάξεις ἁγίων ἀποστόλων μυστικῆς λατρείας. Then follow ch. 16—26. (fol. 550—561.) and the title of ch. 27.: Σίμωνος τοῦ Καναναίου διάταξις ὑπὸ πόσων ὀφείλει χειροτονεῖσθαι ἐπίσκοπος (see Vol. II. pp. 296, 297.). As ch. 15. is the end of the Liturgy, it is clear that the MS. had this whole interpolated piece.

"I owe this information to my learned friend, Professor Roestell of Marburg, who in the same letter (1st March, 1852) has called my attention to *Bickell's* Geschichte des Kirchenrechts (I. 1843). Having procured this highly interesting book from Germany, I find (March 19.) that Bickell (pp. 107—132.) has published, from a Vienna MS., the Greek text of the first book of our Coptic Collection, beginning with the Introduction, the moral precepts of which we have

given as the third chapter of the Book of the Catechumens (pp. 9—14.). We find here (p. 10. § 2.) that the concluding words, which I have given with Tattam from the Coptic thus, 'for *envy* proceeds from these,' ought to read, 'for *murder* proceeds from these.' (*φόνος* instead of *φθόνος*.) On the whole, the two texts are not at all literally identical, but sometimes the one is more explicit, sometimes the other. The Introduction is followed, as in the Coptic text, by the remarkable chapter on the Ecclesiastical Offices, which constitute in the Text-Book (pp. 35—41.) the first Alexandrian set. We are enabled by the Greek text to render intelligible the conclusion of the remarkable canon respecting the two classes of Elders, which is so obscure in the Coptic. 'But if one who has been admonished answers contumeliously, the elders of the altar shall make common cause (with those of the left), and in common council judge him as he deserveth, in order that the rest may fear; let them judge without respect of persons, that the evil may not spread like gangrene, and all the people be carried away.'

"The conclusion of the next canon (III. p. 38.) likewise becomes clearer by the Greek text, which, after the precept that the Reader be the first in the Sunday meetings, runs thus: 'Having a good ear and a good delivery, knowing that he takes the place of an evangelist; for he who filleth the ears of the unlearned shall be considered as acceptable before God.' Finally, the interpretation which I have given of that most obscure passage respecting Martha and Mary seems on the whole to be confirmed by the Greek text, which is the following: Μάρθα εἶπεν· Διὰ Μαριάμ, ὅτι εἶδεν αὐτὴν μειδιῶσαν. Μαρία εἶπεν· Οὐκέτι ἐγέλασα· προέλεγε γὰρ ἡμῖν ὅτε ἐδίδασκεν, ὅτι τὸ ἀσθενὲς διὰ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ σωθήσεται. I take these to be the words of those two holy women being present at the meeting of the Apostles, as they are regularly supposed to be in the Pistis Sophia. Martha says: 'Jesus did not allow us to stand by your side at the Last Supper, because he saw that Mary smiled.' 'No,' said Mary, (like Sarah) 'I did not laugh (when the Lord spoke to me, St. Luke, x. 42.; or when I waited at dinner, St. John, xii.), but what I recollect the Lord to have said is this: "What is weak will be saved by what is strong."' (The weakness of woman will be saved by the strength of the man, who teaches her.) I believe this tradition is meant to answer the question: Why are the women excluded from the *διακονία* at the communion-table, Martha having waited (*διηκόνει*) at that dinner?

"Bickell gives also (pp. 133—137.) a short penitential Order, attributed to the Apostles. It is unnecessary to add, that such penitential

Ordinances are posterior to our age. The curious reader will find the result of the most recent German criticism on this subject of the Penitential Books in the erudite and critical work of *Dr. Wasserschleben*, Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche, only just published. But the greatest treasure is (pp. 148—159.) the account of the Syrian MS. in the National Library at Paris (Cod. Or. St. Germ. No. 38.). This collection, examined by Dr. Zenker, bears the title Διδασκαλία τῶν ἀποστόλων, and exhibits, in 26 chapters, the original text of those first six books of the Apostolical Constitutions. Bickell considers them as extracts; but if so, how is it to be explained that on the whole they leave out exactly what I have in the Second Volume (printed last year) shown to be interpolations?

"Professor Roestell having also mentioned *Muralt's* Catalogus Codicum Bibliothecæ imperialis publicæ Græcorum et Latinorum (Petropoli, 1840; fasc. I.), I have discovered that MS. xv. (codex membranaceus) contains, first, the books of the Greek Apostolical Constitutions; then the ordinary collection of Apostolical Canons under the correct title:

"Οροι κανονικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων;

and, in the third place, a mutilated collection of the same:

Ἕτεροι κανόνες μς' (fol. 139b.).

"This collection represents, according to Muralt, the same text of the 85 canons, but leaves out 39 of them; of which omission no explanation can be given.

"Of the primitive collection there are wanting:

Can. 7—11. 13, 14. 18—20. 26, 27. 30, 31. 33, 34. 36—43.

"Of the additional collection:

Can. 58—60. 64. 70, 71. 74, 75. 81—83. 85."

What I had written in March 1852 as a conjecture is now established as a fact, as the Second Volume of the Analecta shows, in which the Greek text of the first books of the Constitutions, as hitherto known, is confronted with the purer text as it results from the Syrian manuscript of Paris, copied by Dr. Paul Boetticher, the editor of the Constitutions in that Volume. My readers will find there, also, a critical account of the Coptic Canons, the manuscripts of which have been collated by Dr. Boetticher.

II.

THE WORK OF HIPPOLYTUS ON THE GIFTS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND THE VESTIGES OF IT IN THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

DREY, who is very severe upon all who overlook a passage of the Fathers relating to the Constitutions, asserts (p. 170.) that nothing is known of the contents of the work of Hippolytus on the Charismata, or Gifts of the Holy Spirit. This learned man has overlooked an interesting passage of St. Jerome, which evidently relates to this book, and is indeed given (although imperfectly) by Fabricius. For, in the remarkable letter to Lucinius, of the year 398, St. Jerome says, in answer to some queries and conscientious scruples of that rather superstitious and bigoted person:—"With reference to thy questions respecting the Sabbath, whether one ought to fast on it; and respecting the Eucharist, whether one ought to receive it daily, which is said to be the practice of the Roman Church and of that of Spain; Hippolytus, a very powerful writer, has written a treatise, and several other writers have excerpted opinions from different authorities." * It is clear that the treatise of Hippolytus is here quoted in contradistinction to those authors who had cursorily recorded their different opinions upon the subject. What he quotes of Hippolytus must therefore have been written in a work composed expressly on this and similar subjects of ecclesiastical discipline, and considered as an authority. But this could only be the treatise on the Charismata. None of the copious lists of his works contain anything relating to such a subject. Now, there are two manuscripts, one at Oxford (in the Barocci collection), and one at Vienna (Fabr. i. 245–259.),

* Opp. ed. Vallars. Venet. t. iii. 1. p. 430. "De Sabbatho quod quæris utrum jejunandum sit, et de Eucharistia an accipienda quotidie, quod Romana ecclesia et Hispaniæ observare perhibentur, scripsit quidem et Hippolytus, vir dissertissimus, et carptim diversi scriptores ex variis auctoribus edidere."

which give the text of the eighth book as part of the Constitutions of the Apostles, but without the evident interpolations of our present text, under the title:

"Διδασκαλία [πάντων] τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων περὶ Χαρισμάτων.

"*Doctrine of the holy Apostles on the Charismata.*"

The Introduction to this treatise, which perfectly agrees with the text in the eighth book, is a literary composition, the style of which differs equally from the rugged form of the canonical ordinances, and from the moralizing style of the ethical introductions of the first and seventh books. I have no hesitation in saying that it bears on the face of it the stamp of Hippolytus, both as to ideas and style. We have only to expunge the first introductory period (in which also the addition to St. Mark's Gospel, ch. xv., is quoted), and, in what follows, only the conventional insertion of "We, the Apostles," and similar phrases, required by the fiction, and what remains is original and thoughtful. The leading ideas of the treatise are the following:—

"The power of miracles (signs) was given to the Apostles, and likewise through them to those who believed, not for the advantage of the possessors of that power, but on account of the unbelievers. This is the sense of the words of our Saviour: 'Rejoice not that the spirits obey you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven.' For the one is done by His power, the other by our good-will and zeal, of course, as far as we are assisted by Him. It is therefore not necessary that all the faithful should expel demons, or resuscitate the dead, or speak with tongues. Even such miracles do not always work conversion, as is proved by the history of Moses, as well as that of Jesus himself.

"Those, therefore, who have such gifts, must not vaunt themselves over those who have not the gifts of miracles: for there is no one who believes in God, through Christ, who has not received a spiritual gift: it is a gift of the Holy Spirit to throw off the Pagan superstitions, or the Judaic veil, and to believe that the Eternal Word became incarnate, that He lived as man, fulfilling all righteousness, died on the cross, rose from the dead, and was taken up to God. If thou, therefore, hast

received one gift, thy brother has received another; the word of wisdom or of knowledge, or the discerning of spirits, or foreknowledge of the future, or doctrine, or patience, or righteous continence. When Moses wrought his miracles in Egypt, he did not extol himself above his countrymen; nor did Joshua, nor Samuel, who, being a mighty prophet and high-priest, did not despise David, who was also a prophet, and a king. Nor did Elijah or Elisha or Daniel show any presumption.

"Let no one, therefore, despise a brother who does not possess miraculous gifts. 'For, supposing there were no longer infidels, all working of miracles would be superfluous.' Moreover, a captain is nothing without his army, nor a governor without those who obey him. Let, therefore, no bishop extol himself above deacons and presbyters, nor presbyters above the people: for the whole consists of these together. Bishops and presbyters are priests of some one, and the laymen are laymen of some one: to be a Christian is in our power: to be an apostle, a bishop, or the like, is not in our power, but in the power of God, who bestows the gifts."

It is well here to remark, that the author means by Charismata, both the gifts and the ecclesiastical offices which have the promise of the Holy Spirit. This combination of ideas gives us the explanation of the plan and extent of his treatise, and is the real key to the connection between this book and the Apostolical Constitutions. This connection is still more clearly expressed in the next period, where the author says, at the conclusion of the first section of his treatise: "So much may be said on account of those who have been deemed worthy *of the gifts or offices* (χαρισμάτων ἢ ἀξιωμάτων)."

The second chapter or section begins thus: "We add this consideration: not every one who prophesies is pious, nor every one who expels demons holy. Balaam was a prophet: Caiaphas a high-priest. A bishop, weighed down by ignorance, or malice, is not a bishop, but belies his name, and is not brought forward by God, but by men: exactly as an impious king is no longer a king, but a tyrant. This we say, not out of contempt for real prophets, but in order to repress the arrogance of the overbearing. . . . If, therefore, there be a man or woman

among you, who has any such grace in him, let him think humbly of himself, that he may please God."

I believe this is language not unworthy of a holy Christian Father, and entirely in character with the author of the book on Antichrist, and of the courageous opponent of a tyrannical and wicked or ignorant bishop, in the great work on the heresies.

Hippolytus, therefore, evidently treated in his book both of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit and the Offices of the Church. This second part almost necessarily brought him into the very heart of the Apostolic regulations as to discipline connected with worship and service, and the two points mentioned by St. Jerome would very naturally come in as part of the treatise. But there is also, in what follows, historical evidence, of a nature not to be despised, respecting the point, that Hippolytus treated in that work on the Offices of the Church.

The first chapter on Ordinances, which follows after this introduction, is inscribed:

"On the Ordination (χειροτονία), by Hippolytus."

Next follow canons and regulations on the ordination and appointment to the different offices of the Church. (Ch. I. to XV.) These are followed by a similar set of regulations and definitions on the same subject, but quite differently worded. They are attributed to "Simon the Canaanite," and are ushered in again by a piece of literary composition, of a very marked canonical and hierarchical character. (Ch. XVII.) It begins:

"The Bishop blesseth, and is not blessed: he ordaineth, offereth and receiveth blessing from bishops, but not from presbyters. He removeth every member of the clergy, but not a bishop; for a bishop alone cannot remove a bishop.

"The Presbyter blesseth, and receiveth no blessing, except from the bishop and the body of his co-presbyters: he layeth on hands, but doth not ordain nor remove: but he suspendeth his inferiors when they make themselves liable to such a proceeding.

"The Deacon giveth no blessing, but receiveth it from the bishop and presbyter: he doth not baptize, nor make the oblation: but, when the oblation hath been made by the bishop and presbyter, he giveth it to the people, not as priest, but as ministering to priests."

Here we see the very origin of these Constitutions. Towards the end of the ante-Nicene period, they made the old simple collections of customs and regulations into a book, by introducing different sets of "*Coutumes*" by a literary composition, either of their own making (as the latter probably is), or by transcribing or extracting a corresponding treatise of some ancient father. Thus, the man who compiled our seventh book has, as every body now knows, extracted two chapters of the ancient epistle which bears the name of Barnabas. The compiler of the eighth book, or a predecessor in this sort of compilation, has apparently done the same with the work of Hippolytus on the Charismata.

And this latter extract must have acquired great authority: for we find it in the Canons of the Church of Alexandria, preserved to us in Coptic; a work which was only published a few years ago, and which appears to me by far the most interesting composition of this kind which we possess.

I have given, in the first edition, a full extract and analysis of this important work, of which, it appears, no notice had hitherto been taken. The translation is made from the edition of Archdeacon Tattam: where the original text and the sense seemed to require it, I attempted such alterations as the printed Coptic text suggested. The late Dr. Schwarze had, during his stay in England and Paris, made considerable preparations for a more critical edition, and I had learned, from the preface to a posthumous work of that excellent scholar, that the text was ready for being printed. I now express again my hope that this treasure may not be withheld from the public, and may be edited without delay. But, in expressing such a hope, I cannot refrain from wishing that the work on the "Apostolical Constitutions" may meet with a little more charity than the celebrated Coptic manuscript of a Gnostic work in the British Museum, the Πίστις Σοφία, has done at the hands of Professor Petermann. The learned editor has published it without any sort of comment or explanation, although it is almost unintelligible to nine tenths of the readers without them; and although its contents invite critical remarks, particularly with respect to old Egyptian and Platonic speculation. Besides this, merely to remark (as the author does) that

the book is supposed to be a work of Valentinus, betrays utter neglect, or ignorance, of what is known respecting that great man, and, what any critic who reads the book will easily find out, respecting the later age and the Egyptian (probably Marcosian) origin of that confused, although philologically and historically remarkable, production.

But, to return to the "Apostolical Constitutions," we find still further evidence in favour of the early and general belief in a connection between parts of them and Hippolytus. Some Canons of the Syrian Church, and one of the collections of the Abyssinian, entirely independent of each other, are distinctly attributed to Hippolytus, whose name is Semitically written Abulides.

Referring for all further details to the Analecta, I shall conclude the present research by reprinting the general results of my criticism respecting both the Constitutions and the Canons of the Apostles.

III.

GENERAL RESULTS RESPECTING THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS AND CANONS.

A. *General critical Results.*

I THINK I have proved in my analysis, more clearly than has been hitherto done, the ante-Nicene origin of a book, or rather books, called by an early fiction "Apostolical Constitutions," and consequently the still higher antiquity of the materials, both ecclesiastical and literary, which they contain. I have shown that the compilers made use of the Epistle of Barnabas, which belongs to the first half of the second century; that the eighth is an extract or transcript of Hippolytus; and that the first six books are so full of phrases found in the second interpolation of the Ignatian Epistles, that their last compiler, the author of the present text, must either have lived soon after that interpolation was made, or *vice versâ*, or the interpolater and compiler must have been one and the same person. This last circumstance renders it probable that at least the first six books of the Greek compilation, like the Ignatian forgeries, were the produce of Asia Minor. Two points are self-evident: their Oriental origin, and that they neither belong to Antioch nor to Alexandria. I suppose nobody now will trace them to Palestine.

As to the relation between the different collections of this sort, which are here for the first time thoroughly sifted and compared with each other, I have (as the Recapitulations at the end of each critical chapter in the Appendix will more fully exhibit) established the following ten points:

First. That the Greek text contains three distinct collections: the first six books, the seventh, and the eighth.

Second. That the first of these collections (Books I.—VI.) was entirely rewritten, and then interpolated.

Third. That the interpolations, here and in the other collections, betray themselves in most cases, not only by their contents, but also by the fact, that, when they are expunged, a natural order appears in the arrangement of the ordinances, instead of the present entire want of all logical order.

Fourth. That the second Greek collection, or the seventh book, is, in its ordinances, entirely original, and is not reproduced in the other collections, which are not Greek.

Fifth. That the usual text of the eighth book of the Greek Constitutions is a corrupt and interpolated recension of that contained in the Vienna and Oxford manuscripts: exactly as stated by Grabe.

Sixth. That this compilation is connected with Hippolytus, both by the Introduction with which it opens, and which may be considered as substantially representing part of the lost book of Hippolytus, the "Apostolic Tradition respecting the Gifts of the Holy Spirit," and by the wording of the chapters on the Offices of the Church, and perhaps by that of others (Books III. —VI.).

Seventh. That the principal materials of this compilation are contained in the latter portion of the collection of Apostolical Ordinances used in Egypt (Books III. — VI.), and preserved to us in the Coptic text.

Eighth. That the first portion of these Ordinances (Books I. II.) of the Church of Alexandria represents the groundwork of something very like that which the first six books of the Greek Constitutions, a decidedly fraudulent imposture, the forerunner of the Pseudo-Isidorian imposture of the later canon law of the Church of Rome, exhibit in a thoroughly corrupted and comparatively worthless text.

Ninth. That the other collection of the Church of Alexandria, now preserved only in the Abyssinian text and its Arabic translation, bears the same primitive character in its original elements, and represents in the chapter on the admission of Catechumens parts of the eighth book of our Greek Constitutions.

Tenth. That the Syrian collection, or the collection of ordinances as used in the Church of Antioch and its sister

Churches of the Syrian tongue, bears a similar relation to other parts of the eighth book of our Greek Constitutions; but does not coincide with either of the Alexandrian collections.

We therefore have the following six independent collections of ordinances:

I. *Greek Constitutions.* Books I.—VI.: entirely rewritten. (Origin unknown: compare, as to the groundwork, Coptic Collection, Books I. II.)

II. „ „ Book VII.: an interpolated Collection. (Origin unknown: compare, as to the introduction, the introduction to Coptic Collection, Book I.)

III. „ „ Book VIII.: an interpolated Collection. The purer text of this Collection is in the Vienna and Oxford MSS., the first canons bearing the name of Hippolytus. With this text part of the Coptic Collection (Books III. IV. V. VI.) and part of the Abyssinian and the Syrian substantially agree.

IV. *Coptic Collection.* Books I. II.: the Alexandrian Ordinances, Collection A.

V. *Ethiopic Collection.* 38 Canons: the Alexandrian Ordinances, Collection B.

VI. *Syrian Collection.* The Ordinances of the Church of Antioch.

All these collections ought to be edited together, with the necessary critical Prolegomena and analytical Tables; for both of which the principal points have been established in the Analysis prefixed to the text given in the Analecta. The Greek text of Cotelerius is so uncritical, that to print even the second Vienna MS. would have been an immense improvement.

As to the Apostolical Canons, both those received by the Roman Church and the others, their meaning, origin, and interpolations become so clear, when considered in the light of a historical criticism of the Constitutions, and in particular of the collections used in Egypt, that the Table of Contents pre-

fixed to their translation, as given in this Volume, requires no comment.

B. *General Results for the Philosophical History of the Age of Hippolytus.*

I. *As to the Genuineness and historical Importance of the Apostolical Ordinances.*

I believe I have established two leading points for fixing the age and origin of the genuine elements, such as they have been put together in the Book of the Church.

The first of these points is: that some of the regulations, if we look to the contents themselves, are the local "*coutumes*" of the Apostolic Church. I have no hesitation in saying, that I believe some of them go back, if not to the Johannean age, at all events to the one immediately succeeding, the age of Ignatius, or the third Christian generation, according to the system sketched out in the Fourth Letter to Archdeacon Hare.

The second point is: that they all imply a reference to the period in which the Pastoral Letters were written. There we have only elders (called also bishops) and deacons; the Constitutions stand upon the Johannean system of Asia Minor, Episcopacy in the ecclesiastical sense, or the system of three orders, bishops, elders, and deacons.

This fact strongly corroborates the universal evidence of the ancient Church, that the Pastoral Epistles are the work of St. Paul, and when combined with a rational historical criticism of the epistles of Clement of Rome, of Ignatius, and of Polycarp, demolishes all the opposite theories.

Now these genuine elements, whether called Constitutions, or Canons, never formed any real code of law, much less were they the decrees of Synods or Councils. Their collections had nowhere the force of law. Every ancient and great Church presented modifications of the outlines and traditions here put

together; but the constitutions and practices of all Churches were built upon this groundwork. So far it is highly important to know which collection was used in a given leading Church, such as Antioch or Alexandria.

So much as to the importance of these Regulations for the understanding of the constitution, service, and life of the Apostolic and the whole ante-Nicene Church.

II. *As to the Canons of the Apostles, and the ante-Nicene System of Church Government.*

The Canon Law, which began with the Council of Nice, was definitively shaped and fixed in the ninth century by the fraud of the Roman Decretals. Now our Canons furnish direct, positive, and irrefragable proof that this later Canon Law, the law of the Church of Rome, and according to the theory of some English canonists the law of the land, if not expressly abrogated, is in flagrant contradiction to the documents of the ancient Church.

Our Canons, as well as the Constitutions, even the most recent portions of them, acknowledge no definition of the Catholic Church, but that it comprises the whole body of the faithful. The clergy forms a distinct order, but without having any indelible character.

They know no sacrifice of the Mass; but the symbolical expression of the sacrifice of Self, a sacrifice of thankfulness, represented by the Oblation, and connected with the commemoration of Christ's death. They contain no anathema against reason; but an express and solemn recognition of reason, as kindred to the Logos, the Eternal Word of God.

Neither do they acknowledge any supreme hierarchical right of the bishops, in the face of the rest of the Christian people. The people elect the bishop; and if, when a new congregation is forming, other Churches propose a candidate, it has the right of deciding whether it will accept him. There is no difference between "consecration" and "ordination;" one and the same word and prayer serving both for bishop and for presbyter.

The Canon Law of the Council of Nice, and of subsequent councils in the fifth and sixth centuries, establishes the metropolitan system in the ordinary sense of the word. The ante-Nicene Law represents every town, that is to say, every place which is not a mere *villa* (an estate with peasants around it, the origin of our village), as a Church presided over by a bishop and a board of elders (presbyters); but, at the same time, it represents the bishops (not the congregations) of the smaller places as clustered round the bishop of the large town or city which was their natural metropolis. Those bishops formed part of the Council or Presbytery of the mother-congregation for all matters of common interest. In the post-Nicene system the congregation is nothing, its bishop very little. The ante-Nicene Canon Law is fundamentally congregational, and its bishop, as such, represents the independence, and, as it were, sovereignty, of the congregation.

The present Canon Law of Rome is the complete code of a ruling hierarchical corporation, governing the Church by exclusive divine right; judging according to these its by-laws, not only the concerns of the sacerdotal corporation, but whatever in the relations of common life is in any way connected with religion, and ignoring altogether the existence of a Christian state. This theory has been carried out in the Latin Church with an iron consistency, and made the stronghold of a hierarchical power over mankind. Papal Rome has shown, in the formation of its system, much of the spirit which so peculiarly distinguished the ancient Romans in the formation of their civil law. In this civil law they indeed had great men, and developed a true nationality, in times when all the rest of their intellectual and their very national life was almost extinct, from the third to the sixth century. The seeds of such a system of law were sown when the Christian religion became that of the empire: a long process, beginning with Constantine, and terminating only under Theodosius the Great and his sons. Papal Rome worked out this system in its own interest, with a truly Roman spirit.

It has been demonstrated, beyond contradiction, that the historical basis of the Latin Canon Law is forged. But what

we can now prove is, that there was not only no historical foundation for connecting this Canon Law with Apostolic traditions and customs, but that these were in direct contradiction to the new hierarchical despotism. Indeed, no fiction and no fraud would have been necessary, if that had not been the case. We are now able to discover the elements, indeed, in most cases, to restore the text, of an ecclesiastical law, which corresponds with what we know of the primitive state of the Church in the ages immediately following that of the Apostles, and to mark the gradual changes from the first half of the second century, down to the age of transition, the whole of the third century. The discovery of the great work of Hippolytus supplies a very important link in this demonstration.

APPENDIX ON THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE. (Ch. V. VI. VII.)

THE PRINCIPAL PASSAGES OF IRENÆUS ON THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE.*

I.

PASSAGES IN HIS GREAT WORK OF THE HERESIES.

The principal passages are found in the fourth book (c. 32—35. p. 321—329, ed. Grabe), and in the fifth (c. 2. p. 395—400.).

From the Fourth Book.

c. 32. p. 323. Sed et suis discipulis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis non quasi indigenti . . . .

c. 33. Quoniam ergo nomen filii proprium patris est, et in † Deo omnipotenti per Jesum Christum offert Ecclesia.

* Compare, on this subject, *R. Rothe*, "Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche" (1837), and the recent academical *Programme* of this same deep and conscientious author: "Dissertatio de Primordiis Cultus sacri Christianorum." Bonnæ, 1851, 4to. Also *Höffling*, "On the Doctrine of Irenæus respecting the Christian Sacrifice."

† So it stands in the text, without any meaning. It must be corrected: et in [sacrificio altaris] Deo omnipotenti per Jesum Christum offert Ecclesia, as is proved by all the corresponding passages of Irenæus, and the classical passage of St. Augustin (given in the Letter to Dr. Nott, Ch. VII.). The following passage in Origen (c. Celsum, viii.) expresses the same idea:

Τὸν ἕνα Θεὸν καὶ τὸν ἕνα υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Λόγον καὶ εἰκόνα ταῖς κατὰ δύναμιν ἡμῶν ἱκεσίαις καὶ ἀξιώσεσι σέβομεν· προσάγοντες τῷ Θεῷ τῶν ὅλων τὰς εὐχὰς διὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ, ᾧ πρῶτον προσφέρομεν αὐτὰς, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτὸν ἱλασμὸν ὄντα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν προσαγαγεῖν ὡς ἀρχιερέα τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὰς θυσίας

c. 34. p. 324. sq. Igitur Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est ei: non quod indigeat a nobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offert glorificatur ipse in eo quod offert, si acceptetur munus ejus . . . . Offerre igitur oportet Deo primitias ejus creaturæ . . . . ut in quibus *gratus* extitit homo, in his gratus ei deputatus, eum qui est ab eo percipiat honorem . . . . .

p. 326. Igitur non sacrificia sanctificant hominem: non enim indiget sacrificio Deus: sed conscientia ejus qui offert sanctificat sacrificium, pura existens, et præstat acceptare Deum quasi ab amico.

p. 327. (Gr. ex Parall. Joa. Damasceni.) *Προσφέρομεν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ ἴδια, ἐμμελῶς κοινωνίαν καὶ ἕνωσιν ἀπαγγέλλοντες σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος.* (Corrected by Grabe: the text is: *ἀπαγγέλλοντες καὶ ὁμολογοῦντες σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἔγερσιν*; an absurd interpolation: the Latin interpreter has: "Offerimus autem ei quæ sunt ejus, congruenter communicationem et unitatem prædicantes carnis et spiritus.") *Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν* (text: *ἔκκλησιν*, corrected by Grabe: the Latin interpreter has, correctly: "percipiens invocationem Dei,") *οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν* ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου· οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα.* Offerimus autem ei non tamquam indigenti, sed gratias agentes dominationi ejus, et sanctificantes creaturam . . . . Sicuti igitur non his indigens, attamen *a nobis, propter nos,* fieri vult, ne simus infructuosi; ita id ipsum Verbum dedit populo *præceptum faciendarum oblationum* quamvis non indigeret eis, ut disceret Deo servire: sicut et ideo *nos quoque offerre vult munus ad altare frequenter sine intermissione.* Est ergo altare in cœlis (illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes

* Grabe quotes, as illustrating the same view, the following passages:

Justin. Mart. I. § 86.: *Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πῶμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν.*

Cyrill. Hieros. Catech. III.: *ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ.*

Id. ib. eadem de Chrismate: *Τὸ ἅγιον τοῦτο μῦρον οὐκ ἔτι ψιλὸν, οὐδ' ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις κοινὸν, μετὰ ἐπίκλησιν, ἀλλὰ Χριστοῦ Χάρισμα.*

Gregor. Nyssen. de Sacro Bapt., p. 801.: *Μὴ καταφρονήσῃς τοῦ θείου λουτροῦ, μηδὲ ὡς κοινὸν αὐτὸ ἐξευτελίσῃς.*

nostræ diriguntur) et templum, quemadmodum Joannes in Apocalypsi ait: "Et apertum est templum Dei et tabernaculum: ecce enim," inquit, "tabernaculum Dei in quo habitabit cum hominibus."

Grabe (to ch. 32. p. 323. sqq.) introduces this whole argumentation by observations which it may not be useless to extract here, as they show his scholarship and his deep feeling for the ancient Church, but certainly also his one-sided historical views, arising from a total want of philosophical mind. He accuses Luther and Calvin of having fallen into the error of denying the sacrifice of the Eucharist, because he himself is unable to distinguish between Eucharist, in the proper sense, and Communion, or between activeness and receptibility. His words are: "Certum est Irenæum, ac omnes quorum scripta habemus patres, Apostolis sive coævos sive proxime succedentes, S. Eucharistiam pro novæ leges sacrificio habuisse, et panem atque vinum tanquam sacra munera in altari Deo patri obtulisse: ante consecrationem quidem, velut primitias creaturarum, in recognitionem supremi ejus super universa dominii: post consecrationem vero ut mysticum corpus et sanguinem Christi, ad repræsentandam cruentam personalis ejus corporis et sanguinis in cruce oblationem, et beneficia mortis ejus omnibus pro quibus offerretur impetranda." He then calls upon the Protestants: "Ut Ecclesiæ sanctissimas formulas liturgicas, quibus dictum sacrificium Deo offertur, ab illis male e suis cœtibus proscriptas, in usum revocent, et hunc summum Divinæ Majestati honorem debito reddant." This is addressed to the Continental Protestants. Had Grabe forgotten that there is no essential difference in the Communion Service between the English and the old Lutheran liturgies, and that the Reformed Churches have the mention of the spiritual sacrifice in the liturgy as well as the English? and that neither has the Oblation? He would have done well to study the Heidelberg Catechism, the most philosophical of all popular dogmatic works, as far as it bases Christian ethics entirely upon the thankfulness of man towards God, and therefore on the real Christian sacrifice. But of that the good man understood nothing.

From the Fifth Book.

V. 2. (Gr. ex Joa. Damasceni Parall.) Ἐπειδὴ μέλη αὐτοῦ ἐσμὲν καὶ διὰ τῆς κτίσεως τρεφόμεθα, τὴν δὲ κτίσιν ἡμῖν αὐτὸς παρέχει, τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλων καὶ βρέχων καθὼς βούλεται, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς

κτίσεως ποτήριον αἷμα ἴδιον ὡμολόγησε, ἐξ οὗ τὸ ἡμέτερον δεύει αἷμα, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ἄρτον ἴδιον σῶμα διεβεβαιώσατο, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ ἡμέτερα αὔξει σώματα. Ὁπότε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία αἵματος καὶ σώματος Χριστοῦ (t. and Rothe: *εὐχ. σῶμα Χριστοῦ*: intp. Euch. sanguinis et corporis Christi), *ἐκ τούτων δὲ αὔξει καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις· πῶς δεκτικὴν μὴ εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν σάρκα τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου τρεφομένην καὶ μέλος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν;*

Grabe compares IV. c. 57.: "Accipiens panem suum corpus esse confitebatur, et temperamentum calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit." He adds: "Agitur de pane et vino naturali nostrum corpus naturale alentibus, non de substantia personalis Christi corporis et sanguinis." Also Fragm. Iren. ab Œcumenio ad 1. Petr. iii. adligatum (Gr. p. 469.): "Servi Christianorum quæstioni subjecti a dominis se audisse dicebant: *τὴν θείαν μετάληψιν αἷμα καὶ σῶμα εἶναι Χριστοῦ, αὐτοὶ νομίσαντες τῷ ὄντι αἷμα καὶ σάρκα εἶναι.* Blandina martyr tormentis excruciata respondit ad hæc: *Πῶς ἂν τούτων ἀνάσχοιντο οἱ μηδὲ τῶν ἐφειμένων κρεῶν δι' ἄσκησιν ἀπολαύοντες;*

II.

THE PFAFFIAN FRAGMENT.

(Fabric. Hippolyti Opp. pars 2da. Printed also in the Benedictine edition of Irenæus. See Rothe's "Anfänge," p. 316—374., and his "Commentatio," p. 22.)

Οἱ ταῖς δευτέραις τῶν ἀποστόλων διατάξεσι παρηκολουθηκότες ἴσασι, τὸν κύριον νέαν προσφορὰν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ καθεστηκέναι κατὰ τὸ Μαλαχίου *τοῦ προφήτου· Διότι ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου καὶ ἕως δυσμῶν τὸ ὄνομά μου δεδόξασται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, καὶ ἐν πάντι τόπῳ θυμίαμα προσάγεται τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ θυσία καθαρά· ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει λέγει· Τὰ θυμιάματα εἰσὶν αἱ προσευχαὶ τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ ὁ Παῦλος παρακαλεῖ ἡμᾶς, παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ἡμῶν. Καὶ πάλιν·*

Ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως, τουτέστι καρπὸν χειλέων. Αὗται μὲν αἱ προσφοραὶ οὐ κατὰ τὸν νόμον εἰσὶ, οὗ τὸ χειρόγραφον ἐξαλείψας ὁ κύριος ἐκ τοῦ μέσου ἦρκεν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα· ἐν πνεύματι γὰρ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν τὸν Θεόν. Διότι καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας οὐκ ἔστι σαρκικὴ, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ καθαρά. Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσε ἐκφύσαι τοὺς καρποὺς τούτους εἰς τροφὴν ἡμετέραν. Καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσφορὰν τελέσαντες, ἐκκαλοῦμεν (l. ἐπικαλοῦμεν) τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην, καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν. Οἱ οὖν ταύτας τὰς προσφορὰς ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ κυρίου ἄγοντες οὐ τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων δόγμασι προσέρχονται, ἀλλὰ πνευματικῶς λειτουργοῦντες τῆς σοφίας υἱοὶ κληθήσονται.

PREFACE

TO

THE FOURTH VOLUME OF THE FIRST EDITION

(Containing the Reliquiæ Liturgicæ and the Apology).

I CONCLUDE this work about the anniversary of the day on which, last year, I wrote the first of my Letters to Archdeacon Hare. The first two Volumes, together with the Apology of Hippolytus, were written and printed in the last six months of 1851; the third and fourth in the first six months of 1852.

The Apology of Hippolytus is designed to complete the picture of a man and of an age representing the beginnings of Christianity, and throwing therefore a new light on its prospects, which are those of the human race.

The second part of this Volume presents a succinct account of the gradual formation of the Christian worship and rituals in the ancient Church, and gives the texts of the liturgies for the first time critically and historically arranged.

But I cannot take leave of my readers without adding a word on the Ignatian question, upon which the work of Hippolytus bears, directly or indirectly, in so many respects.

I believe I have done something in this book towards bringing it nearer to a complete solution. I have shown the prevalence of an early systematic corruption of the ancient texts in the East by the Byzantines, exactly as such a fraud was practised subsequently by the Romanists in the West. I have in particular shown that the text of the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions exhibits corruptions and interpolations perfectly similar to those which even in Eusebius' time had made a sad twaddler out of that most energetic and original martyr and Father, Ignatius, and a legend out of his true history. Curiously enough, the most striking instance is here also found in a Syriac text. That separation of the original contents of the first six books of the Constitutions from the later interpolations, which I had endeavoured to establish by the mere

application of sound critical principles, is confirmed by a Syriac manuscript at Paris. Finally, I have restored the historical character of Ignatius of Antioch more completely than before, by showing in the Introduction to the Liturgies, and in the Reliquiæ Liturgicæ themselves, that the tradition about his influence upon the formation of the worship of the Church over which he presided is borne out by corresponding cotemporary facts and testimonies, and by the documents of the Antiochene liturgy.

These circumstances may perhaps induce some German critics to reconsider their doubts as to the genuineness of what we possess of Ignatius, and as to the historical character of the accounts of that remarkable man.

It would be useless to expect so much regard for historical criticism from those who, after the Libyan discovery, have endeavoured to maintain the authenticity of that product of impudent forgery called the Seven Epistles of Ignatius. There are undoubtedly good scholars among these men; but they must forgive me if I say that it is, even in England, an anachronism to treat the question of Ignatius and his Epistles apart from collateral facts, and as if the world, since the days of Pearson, had not learned anything as to primitive church history and historical criticism. Their method of conducting controversies would not be tolerated for a moment in the field of classical literature, where men like Porson and Gaisford, Niebuhr and Hermann, Böckh and Ritschl rule, where nothing is at stake except that of which Pilate doubted the existence, and where it is considered as unbecoming to seek truth, not as a judge, in order to find it, but as an advocate, in order to betray it. Until they resolve to test the value of the Greek text by the facts which have come to light through the Libyan discovery, and by the principles of historical criticism, their reasonings must remain barren and fruitless; and until they cease to make the defence of their opinions a matter of faith, it will be useless to dispute with them.

I have already observed in the First Volume how unfortunate those among the English anti-critics have been, who quote against Cureton Professor Petermann's assumption that the Syriac text is an extract from an old Syriac version, of which the Armenian text is a translation. For this assumption there is no ground whatsoever. The Armenian translation represents throughout the text of the Greek Letters, including those which are acknowledged to be false: and its various readings show the thorough corruption of our Greek text. There is not the shadow of a reason to assume that the

Armenian translation was made from a Syriac text, and not, like all other Armenian translations of Greek fathers, from the Greek. But had it been so made, the argument for or against the Seven (or rather twelve) Letters would remain exactly where Professor Petermann found it. His argument, resting upon a gratuitous assumption, is so absolutely null, that it is scarcely possible to formulize it seriously. On the other hand, these same critics, who are so wonderfully struck by Armenian assumptions, find no difficulty in neglecting Cureton's clear and decisive arguments drawn from the character of the Syriac texts, from Syrian authorities, and from Syrian palæography. All these Syrian arguments are tangible points, based upon reality. We find a Syriac text of a Syrian Father, evidently in use in the early Syrian Church; whereas we know nothing of the Armenian translation of the later Greek text, except through an avowedly careless and uncritical edition of the end of the last century. That this translation often concurs with readings exhibited by the Syriac text cannot in itself alone prove that it was made from a Syriac original, from which the Three Letters were afterwards extracted. We might as well say that the old Latin translation, as exhibited in the manuscript of Caius College, was made from the Syriac, because it often supposes, in the Greek original, the same reading which the Syrian translator had before him. Granting, however, the translation not to have been made from the interpolated Greek text, but from a Syrian translation of the same (which may have existed)*, why should not the genuine passages of that text often come nearer to the Syriac text than to thatof the Medicean manuscript? Certainly there is no argument whatever in this circumstance, however you turn it. On the contrary, a historical critic will remember what Moses of Korene expressly says†, that in his youth, that is to say, in the earlier part of the fifth century, a considerable number of Syrian manuscripts were brought into Armenia from Syria. This is, on the whole, the earliest age in which the Armenian translation could have been made: an age of systematic ecclesiastical fraud, abounding in unscrupulous forgeries and impudent interpolations, whereas, the classical age for Syrian translations, the second and third centuries, is, comparatively speaking, pure. That the difference between the Armenian and Syrian text, is, on the whole, parallel to the difference of those two ages, is

* See Cureton, Corpus Ignat. p. 344, 345.

† Moses Chorenensis opp. interp. Levaill. ii. p. 165., as quoted by D. Pitra himself (Prolegg. p. viii.).

now proved by a fragment brought to light within the last few months by the indefatigable Benedictine Father, Dom Pitra, in his meritorious work, the Spicilegium Solesmense. In this collection of inedited patristic remains, a fragment of Irenæus is given, first from the Syriac text (communicated by Cureton to the editor), and secondly in Armenian, from an Armenian MS. copied for Dom Pitra by the Mechitarists at Venice. As this beautiful fragment is also intrinsically important for the theological inquiries of this work, I give the two texts in the note.* Will an English critic seriously maintain

* Syrian Text.

Lex et prophetæ et evangelistæ proclamaverunt de Christo, quod natus est ex virgine; et quod passus est super lignum: et quod apparuit e· sepulchro; et quod ascendit ad cœlos; et quod a Patre glorificatus est; et quod est rex in æternum; et quod hic est intellectus perfectus, Verbum Dei; qui ante lucem genitus est; qui cum eo est conditor universi, fictor hominis; qui est in omnibus omnia: in patriarchis patriarcha, in legibus lex, in sacerdotibus princeps sacerdotum, in regibus gubernator, in prophetis propheta, in angelis angelus, in hominibus homo, in patre filius, in Deo Deus, rex in æternum.

II. Hic enim est qui Noemo fuit nauta, et Abrahamum duxit; qui cum Isaaco ligatus est, et cum Jacobo fuit peregrinus;

Armenian Text.

Lex et prophetæ et evangelia declaraverunt Christum natum ex virgine et in cruce passum,

et suscitatum e mortuis, et in cœlum elevatum et glorificatum

et regnantem in sæcula. Ille ipse dicitur perfectus intellectus, Dei verbum, quod primitus pulchre nati hominis (fuit) conditor;

in omnibus omnia, in patriarchis patriarcha, in lege lex, in sacerdotibus sacerdos, in regibus princeps ductor, in prophetis propheta, in angelis angelus, in hominibus homo, in patre filius, in Deo Deus, rex in æternum.

II. Ipsemet direxit Noemum in navi [cum Josepho venumdatus est] et Abrahamum conduxit; cum Isaaco ligatus, cum Jacobo peregrinavit; [cum Moyse fuit dux et secundum populum legislator; in prophetis prædicavit; de virgine incarnatus, in Bethleem natus; ab Johanne susceptus et in Jordane baptizatus; in deserto tentatus ac dominus repertus. Ipse congregavit apostolos, et cœlorum regnum prædicavit; illuminavit cæcos et suscitavit mortuos, in templo visus, a populo nec fide dignus habitus; a sacerdotibus comprehensus et coram Herode perductus; in conspectu Pilati judicatus, in corpore se manifestans, in ligno sus-

that the Syriac text is mutilated, and the Armenian text genuine? I suppose he will leave that rather to the good Benedictine Father. I have given a still more striking instance respecting the purity of Syriac texts, and the systematic interpolation of the Byzantines, in my note on Dr. Zenker's discovery of the Syriac manuscript at Paris, which evidently contains the genuine text of that monster of Greek interpolation, called the first six books of the Constitutions.

But there are many other camels to be swallowed by those who have set their hearts upon proving, by Pearson's arguments, that a text which he never knew is not genuine. And waiving these arguments, is it not strange that they bring forward against one of the first Syriac scholars of Europe, their countryman, the name of an Armenian scholar in Germany, who has in his favour neither argument nor personal critical authority? The internal evidence of the case is so strong, that it is almost with a mixed feeling of pleasure and of regret that I announce a fact which appears destined to put an end to all dispute, as to the principal point.

It is neither accurate nor fair to speak of Cureton's text as being founded upon "a Syrian manuscript containing other extracts," since from the beginning Cureton had two manuscripts of "The Three

---

Syrian Tex	Armenian Text.
	pensus et a mortuis suscitatus, apostolis monstratus, et ad cœlos evectus ad dexteram Patris sedet, et ab eo uti mortuorum resurrectio glorificatus; et salus perditorum, degentibus in tenebris lumen, et iis qui nati sunt redemptio;] salvatorum
pastor eorum qui salvi sunt, et sponsus ecclesiæ et dux cherubim, princeps exercitus angelorum; Deus ex Deo, filius ex patre, Jesus Christus rex in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.	pastor, et ecclesiæ sponsus, cherubim auriga et exercitus dux angelorum; Deus ex Deo, Jesus Christus salvator noster.

The two texts agree literally, in the passages common to both, with the exception of the concluding words, which, therefore, according to the general principles of criticism, must be considered doubtful, especially as the Syriac text has here some words not found in the Armenian. But what can be more awkward than the insertion of Joseph between Noah and Abraham? or the whole interpolation as to Jesus himself, which dwells on points either not belonging at all to the argument of Irenæus, or already mentioned in the first part of this beautiful Christology, so spontaneously flowing out of St. John's prologue?

Letters." The one contained all three, with the significant title alluded to : the other had (from evident want of space) only the first of them (that to Polycarp), but, as it exhibited literally the same text, it was necessarily a second testimony in favour of the Three against the Seven. Subsequently, in the Corpus Ignatianum (p. xxxi. sqq.), Cureton gave notice of a third manuscript, containing all "The Three Epistles of Ignatius," with a text absolutely identical, and presenting only some highly interesting various readings. Is it not difficult for unbiassed critics to suppose that all the Epistles of Ignatius which we find in his native country and his Church are "Extracts" made by "a Monk"? How strange to endeavour to strengthen the critical weakness of this argument, or rather to justify this unwarranted assumption, by the gratuitous (I had almost said unjustifiable, because totally unsupported) conjecture that the supposed "Monk" was a heretic, who wished to deprive "the Holy Catholic Church" of one of its supports! The fictitious wicked man is not charged with any interpolation, a sin which seems to have been the monopoly of the "orthodox" Byzantines : but he is gravely suspected of having left out what a Monophysite (bishop, monk, or simple clergyman) could have no more interest in omitting than a Byzantine.

But now to the fact. I am assured by unquestionable authority that Colonel Rawlinson has himself seen, at Bagdad, a manuscript of the New Testament in Syriac, which has "The Three Epistles of Ignatius" appended to the sacred records, exactly as the Codex Alexandrinus has "The Epistles of Clemens of Rome" appended to the same holy writ. I hope those who take an interest in the truth will soon be enabled to gratify their curiosity by a sight of this treasure in the British Museum.

Alas for the worshippers of the Pearsonian arguments, and for the fiction of the garbling Monk, and for the revival of the whole controversy of the seventeenth century!

As soon as that remarkable text shall have been collated, and the result laid before the public, the time will be come for a definitive reconstruction of the genuine Greek text according to the Syriac manuscripts, with the help, here and there, of the Armenian translation. The real difficulty under which I laboured in my attempt to restore it was simply, that we had then (with the exception of the Epistle to Polycarp) only one imperfect Syriac manuscript; whereas now we have two, and shall soon have three complete and independent manuscripts for all the three Epistles. I ought to have adhered more

strictly still to the Syriac text. I refrained from doing so, not so much out of deference to the Greek, thoroughly corrupted and patched up as it is, but because we had only one Syriac manuscript. A difficult reading might be nothing but a blunder of the copyist. Finally, we had not then the Armenian version, which evidently is to be considered as an independent witness for the original readings of the Greek text, so unfavourably represented hitherto by one Greek MS Imperfect therefore as my attempt necessarily was to restore the true reading, and to prove the completeness and show the connection of the original text, I may be satisfied with the support which the third Syriac MS. has since given to many of my assertions. Thus, in the celebrated concluding passage of the Epistle to the Ephesians about the three mysteries, the Syriac MS. discovered after my edition has the very words "and the death" (of our Lord), which I had inserted in the restored text, although they were wanting in the only Syriac MS. then known.

In a similar way I may congratulate myself on the support which the Armenian translation (miserably garbled as it has been by the unknown Constantinopolitan editor, who has not even disdained the correspondence between Ignatius and the Virgin Mary) gives to my view of the nature of our text. For it is a new proof that our present Greek text has gradually been more and more corrupted by the interpolators in the difficult passages; and it confirms the readings of the Syriac version in most cases where they are at variance with the text of the Mediccan or Colbertine MS. Indeed, the only critical importance of the Armenian version consists in this, that it is in so many instances an independent, although an unwilling, testimony in favour of the Syriac text.*

I cannot show this better to the learned reader than by giving the whole genuine Ignatian Epistle to the Ephesians, the most interpolated and undoubtedly the most difficult of the three, as much as possible in accordance with the present Syriac text.

This restoration is checked by the Armenian, and here and there by the literal Latin translation, which is independent of the only Greek MS. in which the letter has come down to us. The Epistle to the Ephesians is allowed to be in each text the most difficult one, a circumstance which is most unfairly passed over in silence by those who charge the Syriac text with obscurity: it is besides by far the most interpolated of the three genuine epistles. Let any unprejudiced

* Now printed with the other two Epistles in the first volume of Analecta.

reader go through the English version which I add to the provisionally restored text, and which is as literal as possible*, and let him then judge whether it is an unconnected cento of sentences extracted from the Greek text. However involved the sentence of the laboured introduction may appear, it is on the one hand perfectly intelligible, and, without ceasing to be original, reminds us, in this respect also, of the scarcely less involved (and much longer) first two sentences of the Pauline Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 5—14. i. 15—ii. 10.). But it is one which a bishop of that time, the disciple of St. John, might naturally write on his way to the amphitheatre, in answer to the mark of Christian kindness shown him by the Ephesians in sending their bishop Onesimus, to express their Christian sympathy on his arrival from Antioch at Smyrna. Nay, it is one of the most precious gems of Apostolic Christianity, transparent in spite of its peculiarities, and worthy of the man who left so indelible a memory behind him.

I shall conclude this Preface by saying a few words respecting the uncalled-for aggressive spirit in which the editor of a reprint of Pearson's "Vindiciæ," Archdeacon Churton, has attempted to handle this question. Mr. Churton displays in his Introduction a classical latin style, which in other times, perhaps, would have stood in place of critical argument; and he employs a facetious manner, well suiting a retreat from a lost cause. As a specimen I shall only allude to the advantage he takes of a manifest misprint, in order to throw ridicule on an argument which he does not even attempt to refute. Pearson had not disdained to supply the want of any solid testimony for the Greek text of Ignatius before Eusebius by some conjectures, which, as he says, pleased him very much. One of these is, that Theophilus, who was a successor of Ignatius towards the end of the second century, had alluded to the celebrated passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians, c. xix. The testimony would be very important, if it had any existence; but it rests upon the incredible assumption of the genuineness of a Commentary upon St. Matthew, bearing the name of Theophilus, under whose name there existed indeed, according to Jerome, a commentary on the Gospel. Now I had said that no honest critic could doubt (nor is there any one who maintains a contrary opinion) that the commentary preserved to us is a later imposture, not even worthy of the younger Theophilus of the end of the fourth century. Bishop Fell and the Hamburgh editor of

* See first volume.

Theophilus (1724) have indeed made it quite impossible to entertain such an opinion: but the point was already established in Pearson's time. How, then, could Pearson indulge in such a conjecture? This (and nothing else) I had said in a note (p. 239.), with the remark that I merely mentioned the circumstance in order to justify my not having named that Father among the testimonies of the second century. By an oversight, the page (printed on the other side of the German Ocean) exhibits, instead of "Theophilus the Elder," the words "Hippolytus the Elder." Now what does Mr. Churton do? He calls upon me emphatically to show him where Pearson quotes Hippolytus as an evidence!* He might have known that Theophilus was meant; my referring to Jerome's words allowed no doubt that I alluded to Pearson's argument respecting Theophilus. But he thought it good fun to amuse his readers by so cheap a joke. I do not blame him for that; it is a matter of taste: only I wonder how the author of an edition of the "Vindiciæ," with a Preface and Notes, which are to be "ad modernum controversiæ statum accommodatæ," could have omitted commenting upon Pearson's conjecture, and in particular upon the note which proves that he knew very well that the whole conjecture had no foundation whatever. In that note Pearson mentions the doubts of Tillemont and other learned critics respecting the commentary which impudently bears the name of Theophilus; and he adds: "Non tamen negandum est, scriptorem, quisquis fuerit, longe Theophilo et Hieronymo juniorem, scripta priorum patrum excerpsisse, et Theophili fortasse inter alios." Thus Pearson himself, whose quotation is to make Theophilus an evidence, admitted that the author of a commentary quoted by him as evidence of the second century, was not Theophilus, and was later even than Jerome. As such reasoning seems incredible, I will give the very words of Jerome. He says: "Martyr Ignatius etiam quartam addidit causam, cur a desponsata conceptus sit (Jesus), ut partus, inquiens, ejus celaretur diabolo, dum eum putat non de virgine, sed

* P. xi. "Venerandus noster Antistes, si Illustrem Equitem audias, S. Hippolytum inter testes Ignatianos acciri voluit: quo uno exemplo actum esse jam ait de fide et existimationi Pearsoni. Fortasse: sed interim id unum deest, ut indicet nobis Illustris Eques, quo tandem loco Pearsonus Hippolytum, velut alter Æsculapius, mutum et mortuum inter vivos et valentes ad testimonium dicendum resuscitaverit. Qui enim Pearsoni Vindicias perlegerint, negant sibi novum hunc Virbium inter testes usquam obviam fuisse."

de uxore generatum." These words prove nothing but that Jerome knew that celebrated passage of Ignatius' Epistle to the Ephesians which the Syriac text acknowledges, and which Origen quotes. Jerome, I am afraid, had himself never read the epistles of Ignatius; indeed Cureton has made this more than probable in his Corpus Ignatianum (p. lxvii. sq.). It is, therefore, a felicitous assumption that he had transcribed this observation from an earlier commentator: but this probably was Origen, whose commentaries on the Gospel he had translated. We know at least this commentary, and it contains the passage: whereas of Theophilus' commentary we know nothing. Cotelerius' opinion, therefore, that Jerome copied the remark from Origen, is the only reasonable one; to refer it to Theophilus the Elder because it is found in the commentary of an author whom Pearson himself allows to have been later than Jerome even, merely because that late writer might have read Theophilus, and Theophilus might have said such a thing, is unworthy of a serious critic. If Mr. Churton thinks differently, I am ready to give him the whole benefit of the argument; only, if he attacks my remark upon Pearson's proceeding, he must not elude the discussion by availing himself of a misprint.

Still, this is not what induced me to say that Pearson had acted in that controversy more as an advocate, than as an impartial critic. Pearson relates that Jerome mentions having read those commentaries on the Gospel: so Jerome, indeed, does; but (what Pearson omits to say) he did not believe them to be genuine. Here are his words*: "I have read under his (Theophilus') name commentaries on the Gospels and on the Proverbs of Solomon: they appear to me not to agree with the elegance and the style of the works named above (the lost book against Marcion, and the Treatise against Autolycus)." I did not wish to enlarge more on this painful subject, and therefore simply referred the reader to what is said on it in the Hamburgh edition. Now that I am obliged to return to that note in self-defence, I cannot avoid stating the case as it is: and I may refer English readers to Dr. Fell's preface to Theophilus, reprinted by J. C. Wolf. The alternative is simply this. The Latin commentaries which bear the name of Theophilus are either later than

* Hieronymus De Viris illustr.: "Theophilus . . . . . Legi sub nomine ejus in Evangelium et in Proverbia Salomonis commentarios, qui mihi cum superiorum voluminum elegantia et phrasi non videntur congruere."

Jerome, passages from whose writings and those of Ambrose occur in them, or they are not. The first was Pearson's own opinion, as it is, indeed, that of all critics since Tillemont: Grabe's incidental treatment of this question is very unsatisfactory, comes to no conclusion, and is justly criticised both by Wolf and the Benedictine editor. On the second supposition, those commentaries are the translation of the same text which Jerome read, but did not believe to be genuine. In either case they cannot honestly be brought forward in support of the conjecture that Theophilus had read the Epistles of Ignatius; much less are they an argument in favour of the Greek text against the Syriac.

Nor can I allow the learned editor to misrepresent to English readers the state of critical opinion in Germany respecting the relation which the Syriac text bears to the Greek. Mr. Churton is welcome to the obtuse argument of a reviewer who triumphantly observes that Baur has not been convinced by my arguments, but thinks the Syriac text as little authentic as the Greek. It is, indeed, very natural that he should; for he believes the Gospel of St. John, alluded to evidently in our Epistles, to have been written about seventy years after the death of Ignatius. But when Mr. Churton says that Neander, in the latter part of his life, gave up the Syriac text, it is first necessary to state that this great historian (whom Mr. Churton calls "vir in antiquitate ecclesiastica satis spectatus") never admitted the Pearsonian text, and doubted in particular all that relates in the Seven Letters to the history of Ignatius' death and journey, on which the whole structure of these letters is built. Now his last published words on the subject are in a note to his new edition of the History of the Christian Church (vol. i. p. 1140.) of the year 1843, and therefore anterior to Cureton's discovery. But it appears from his own and from other correspondence, which lies before me, that Neander could not quite make up his mind as to the genuineness of the Syriac epistles, although he did not think them by any means so objectionable as the Greek text. Mr. Churton has, therefore, no right to quote him on the question at issue, which is this: Whether the Syriac manuscript be an extract from a genuine text, or an earlier one? As to the other German critics, not one believes the Pearsonian text to be authentic, with the exception of some Romanist writers (of whom only the Rev. Dr. Hefele merits even a mention), and perhaps of Prof. Petermann, the Armenian scholar and meritorous editor

of the text and all its various readings. But the difference in the opinions of the German critics who have treated that subject, from Baur to Thiersch, is simply, that some believe with me that the Syriac text has preserved the genuine writings of Ignatius, whereas others think that even in this briefer form we have not the writings of Ignatius, but a work of fiction. It must not be forgotten, however, that the philological proofs of the authenticity of the Syriac text, most imperfectly known to those who entertained doubts on this subject, have been very much strengthened subsequently by the manuscripts recently discovered, all exhibiting the same text, and proving it to have been, at all events, not the product of an obscure epitomizing Monk, but the acknowledged text of the early Syrian Church. Now this Church, which is that of Antioch and of Ignatius, has in other cases preserved the purer text, in opposition to Byzantine and Armenian corruptions and interpolations.

When, therefore, the editor of Pearson asserts that the present state of critical opinion in Germany is best represented by what Mone, a Romanist writer on medieval antiquities, whom Mr. Churton quotes as the author of "a distinguished Treatise on Liturgies," has asserted, I beg first to refer the reader to the fourth chapter of the Reliquiæ Liturgicæ, which treats on the Gallican Liturgy, that he may judge for himself of the authority of this ultramontane antiquarian. As to the assertion that the result of modern criticism has been an entire confirmation of the authority of the Seven Epistles; it is difficult to decide which is more astonishing, that Mr. Mone should pronounce a statement so notoriously contradicted by the facts, or that the English editor of the "Vindiciæ" should bring before the public this insignificant, and in every respect unwarranted, ridiculous assertion, as representing the opinion of the critics of Germany.

To conclude with a more agreeable subject, I will mention here that, during the last months, Professor Jacobi has published a learned and ingenious commentary on the fragments of Basilides "contained in the work of Hippolytus." I am able moreover to refer my readers to a new and excellent work by Prof. Höffling of Erlangen, on the doctrine of the ancient Church respecting the sacrifice and worship, which unites all the special researches of the learned author on this important subject. Finally, I wish to call the attention of my English and German readers to the History

of the Christian Church (Mercersburgh, 1851), by the Rev. Philip Schaff, Professor of Divinity at Mercersburgh College, Pennsylvania. This is the first learned theological work in German composed in the United States, and undoubtedly the best published on the subject in that country. I hail this work in both respects as the harbinger of a great and glorious future. It is worthy of a German scholar, of a disciple of Neander (to whom the work is dedicated), of a citizen of the United States, and of a believing and free Christian and Protestant: it stands on German ground, but it is not the less original for that.

Carlton Terrace, August 7. 1852.

THE END OF HIPPOLYTUS AND HIS AGE.

LONDON:
A. and G. A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-street-Square.

ERRATA.

Page 341. line 14. for "*Porta Romana*" read "*Portu Romano.*"
352. line 11. from bottom, for "captavi" read "captivi."

D1.13